The Journal of Pastoral Care

VOL. XI WINTER, 1957 No. 4

CONTENTS

FAITH FOR THE CRISIS OF MARRIAGE
The Rev. Carl Michalson ..... *Page 193*

THE EVOLUTION OF A MINISTERIAL COUNSELING CENTER
Robert B. Deitchman, M.D. ..... *Page 207*

THE MINISTER AND THE PSYCHIATRIST AS A TEAM
Harry G. Gianakon, M.D. ..... *Page 215*

TRAINING OF EMPATHIC ABILITIES: A NOTE
The Rev. Orlo Strunk, Jr. ..... *Page 222*

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED PASTORAL STUDIES: A NEW DEVELOPMENT
The Rev. Reuel L. Howe ..... *Page 226*

EDITORIALS ..... *Page 229*

COMMUNICATIONS ..... *Page 231*

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES ..... *Page 235*

NOTES AND COMMENTS ..... *Page 248*

A Professional Journal

sponsored by the Council for Clinical Training

and the Institute of Pastoral Care.

The Journal of

Pastoral Care

PUBLISHED IN THE INTEREST OF SHARING EXPERIENCES AND INTERPRETATIONS OF PASTORAL WORK, INTERPROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS, THE THEOLOGY OF PASTORAL CARE, AND CLINICAL PASTORAL TRAINING.

Editor
ERNEST E. BRUDER

Associate Editor
ROLLIN J. FAIRBANKS

Managing Editor
LUBERTA M. MCCABE

Business Manager
EMILY A. SPICKLER

Editorial Board
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
CARL MICHALSON
SAMUEL H. MILLER
WAYNE E. OATES
OTIS R. RICE
DON C. SHAW
CARROLL A. WISE

Book Reviews
ROLLIN J. FAIRBANKS

Abstracts and Exchanges
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER

Published quarterly by the Council for Clinical Training, Inc., at 1312 Eye St., N. W., Washington 5, D. C.

Subscription: $4.00 a year; single copies, $1.00 each. All business correspondence (including subscriptions) should be directed to Miss Emily A. Spickler, Business Manager, Council for Clinical Training, Inc., 2 East 103rd St., New York 29. Editorial correspondence should be sent to the Managing Editor, Dr. Luberta M. McCabe, 61 Lexington Avenue, Cambridge 38, Mass. Books, reviews, and correspondence pertaining thereto should be sent to the Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, 12 Phillips Place, Cambridge 38, Mass.

Payment is made for original articles and editorials following publication.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957 by the Council for Clinical Training, Inc. All rights reserved.

The Journal of
Pastoral Care

VOL. XI WINTER, 1957 No. 4

FAITH FOR THE CRISIS OF MARRIAGE

THE REV. CARL MICHALSON, PH.D.

Professor of Systematic Theology, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey

The most dramatic crisis of our day is taking place in the institution of marriage. Gradually the frequency of divorce is transforming the structure of marriage into a polygamous form. To be sure, it is only a "one-at-a-time polygamy" and it rarely adds up to more than deuterogamy. It is a social crisis, nonetheless, in which the character of a major institution is on trial.

I am concerned here, however, with marriage as a personal crisis. Hence, the question of marriage as an institution will be subordinated to the question of marriage as a bisexual relation. I do not mean that the institutional crisis is not urgent and that the Christian faith has nothing to say to it. Quite to the contrary. The wilting of the institution of marriage is significantly related to the flowering of secularism. The secular man is the man who does not lift up his heart. He turns in upon himself. He is, as Luther said, the man who is "all curled up in himself,

Chapter VI in *Faith for Personal Crises,* to be published by Scribners in January 1958.

cor incurvatum in se," "the fabulous wings unused, folded in the heart" (Christopher Frye). In such a climate of life, what chance for survival has an institution whose very essence is in turning outward toward others with self-giving love?

The ingredients for personal crisis in marriage are ample enough, however, to treat by themselves. They are even more obvious in marriage than in vocation. In vocation one must pour his whole life into one job. If he is not whole, the totalitarian demands of vocation splinter his life. Likewise in marriage one gives his whole life to one person. If he is not whole, he cannot be resolute. Resoluteness is the stuff of fidelity; and where fidelity is lacking in a marriage, crisis is incipient. Either the irresolute self fractures the marriage or the imperious demands of marriage shatter the irresolute self.

The fact that one is unmarried or even the fact that one has no intention of being married does not alter the fact that marriage is for that person a crisis. The resolution not to marry no more avoids the crisis of marriage than the resolution not to eat avoids the problem of indigestion. Marriage is indicated for the human race universally in the nature of bisexuality. Therefore, all states in life must be defined in relation to marriage.

If one accepts that position, then there are three situations in which the crisis of marriage can be experienced. Here I adopt a classification once suggested by Otis Rice. There is the *broken* situation, where the partners to a marriage are separated by reason of divorce, death, or desertion. There is also the *bent* situation, which includes all marriages not included among the broken. For all marriage exists under some degree of tension, from the slightest strain all the way to the breaking-point. The most serious stage of crisis in this situation is *fracture.* Not quite broken, yet strained to the breaking-point, it becomes a real question as to whether the marriage can be salvaged and even more important whether it pays to make the effort. Amputation might be required in the last analysis. The great bulk of testimony from couples who have recovered from fractured marriages resembles an abstract on orthopedics. Fractured bones which have healed are usually stronger after the fracture than before. There is real hope in that for people who are living through the bent situation.

Many young people, but a great many older people as well, classify in what might be called the situation that has *not yet jelled.* This classification includes a whole gamut of cases. There are those who have every expectation of marriage but are only waiting for the maximal conditions. There are those who are weighing the decision to marry against other socially acceptable ways of life which require celibacy. And there are those whose adjustment to life is so exceptional that heterosexual marriage seems impossible and in some cases even revolting. For all these

cases Paul the Apostle has left a reassuring word: "It is better not to marry" (1 Cor. 7:38). This is, as Karl Barth has called it, the "magna charta" of the single person.

Now the fact that I have proposed to discuss marriage as a crisis is warning enough. You can expect that what I say of marriage will not be all sweetness and light. It is the great paradox of marriage that, while it is the most idealized of all human relations, it is at the same time filled with the greatest perils. Surely you are aware that in the Bible all the evils of the human race are traceable to the first marriage. But possibly you take little stock in these early Genesis stories. Maybe then you will be more impressed by Sigmund Freud when he says: "There is some hatred at the bottom of all relations of affection." But perhaps by now you are unmoved by long-hair psychology. Maybe you will be more greatly moved by the sentiment in the popular ballad sung by the Ink Spots:

> You always hurt the ones you love,
> The ones you mustn't hurt at all.

Marriage is that delicately balanced. Nietzsche could say of it, "One does not know of love who has not despised just what he loved." And Kierkegaard could say, echoing Martin Luther, "Thy wife is first of all thy neighbor, and thou shalt love thy neighbor." It would seldom occur to a young lover to regard his beloved as the object of an obligation to love. And there are not many wives who enjoy being loved as a neighbor, although some men are loving their neighbors better than their wives. But, as Luther said, since the wife is the nearest neighbor she should be loved the most. The real revelation in this whole matter is that one should have to be commanded to love the person who in every respect should be the most lovable. If one does not see that gloomy side of marriage he is equipped with only one side of a paradox.

On the other hand, marriage is the last human relation mankind would be willing to vote out of existence. It is the most sought after, the most filled with the sheer joy of living, and the most extolled in the finer arts. And in the Bible, the relation between a man and a woman in marriage is the continuous analogy for the deepest relation in life, the relation between God and man. In the Old Testament God is partner to a marriage in which Israel is the bride. In the New Testament Jesus Christ chooses the Church for his bride. And in that very Pauline letter to the Ephesians (Chapter 5) marriage is virtually treated as a sacrament (what Augustine called a *quoddam* sacrament). Husbands are to be the head of their wives as Christ is head of the Church. This does not mean, as many have twisted it to mean, that husbands have a proprietary relation over wives. It means that when people look at a marriage they should see a visible sign of God's invisible grace. In the way men love their wives should be seen the way Christ loves the Church. The man who reminds his wife that woman was taken from the rib of man should

be reminded by his wife that the rib was taken, as Francis de Sales has said, from the side "which was nearest his heart, to the end that she might be loved by him cordially and tenderly." Now when one participates profanely in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the consequences, according to the faith of the church, are not innocent. One does so to his own damnation. And when one violates the holiness of the mystery (or sacrament, as the Biblical term can as well be translated) of marriage, he does so to his own damnation.

The conditions which contribute to breakdown in marriage are synonymous with the profaning of its holiness. I will discuss here five of the most serious of these breaches.

First, there is *exploitation*. When one marries out of love for what the other can do for him, that is exploitation in its commonest and most vulgar form. Karl Marx, who knew a great deal about exploitation, saw this possibility in marriage. As he said, the bourgeoise man has made of his wife a mere instrument of production. It is true that the family, which was made to be an affectional unit, often becomes an economic unit. The love nexus is often displaced by what William James used to call "the cash nexus." Before you know it, the tidy reciprocity symbolized on the bathroom towels by "his" and "hers" has been taken down, and in its place is only "mine," "mine"!

When one marries out of love-for-what-the-other-can-become, that is exploitation in its cruelest form. In this instance, the wife sets up an image of the man she hopes she has wedded. It is really the image which she loves; and she virtually withholds love from the man she has married until he achieves the image she loves. In so doing she sentences her man to a wretched race to achieve the goal which will qualify him for her love. The wretchedness consists not simply in the love fast but in the fear of failure to qualify, which cripples the very faculties by which achievement arrives.

When one marries out of an emotional *need* for the love of another, that is exploitation in its more morbid and diseased form. Now everyone has the right to the love of others and cannot live without it. Man made in the image of God is a social creature. Traditional theology has made much of this. For when God said, "Let *us* make man in *our* image," he may not simply have been using the editorial "we." For God is a trinity of persons, a kind of social nature. And when man is made to image God's Reality, he is involved in the privilege and responsibility of a social relationship.

But love which is a right cannot be required. It must be free to give and be given. Yet if one desperately needs love for reasons of his basic anxiety, insecurity, and emotional hunger, he creates a low pressure area in his personality into which he sucks the love of another to feed his need. This turns the lover into a vampire. True and wholesome married love

can exist only where two lovers, each of whom is capable of standing on his own two feet, give and receive each other freely. The rebellious personality exploits marriage because he needs love to feed his omnivorous ego-demand. He has a concept of himself as lovable, and not to be receiving love would jar his self-esteem. The recessive personality exploits marriage for the same reason. He has a concept of himself which leads him to fear that he is unlovable, and he desperately needs confirmation that he is wrong about himself. Not everyone who whispers "kiss me" in her lover's ear is freely offering her love. She may as easily be asking for your stamp of approval upon her uncertain self-esteem. This is not love, even though the side-effects may momentarily feel the same. It is exploitation.

There is no solid basis for marriage in any form of exploitation. Exploitation only stunts the growth of marriage by making love a clinging vine. Like a vampire, it sucks the blood of love while giving nothing. Picture a young couple standing before the altar of the church. She looks up at him as much as to say, "At last I've found someone upon whom I can depend." But he looks at her as much as to say, "At last I've found someone upon whom I can depend!" In a moment you can detect that each is leaning upon the other and that what they are building is not a marriage but a house of cards. And then the minister begins to read the marriage ritual. What he seems to say is, "Marriage is a triangular affair. For marriages are made in heaven. One ought not therefore to expect gratifications of another which can only finally be granted by God. One who does not stand erect in the presence of God in the full understanding of who he is will only lean against another, forcing him into a role he was never meant to play. Marriage is based not upon mutual self-dependence but upon the open reliance of two independent souls upon the God above. That liberating dependence makes mutual love a life of freedom."

A young lover knocks at the door of his beloved. She calls from deep within her chambers, "Who is there?" He answers, "It is I." She replies, "My door does not open to such as thou." He retires into the desert to mourn, examine himself, and contemplate the mysteries of life. When he returns, he knocks at the door of his beloved again, and she calls, "Who is there?" He answers, "It is thou." The doors of the chamber swing open to him. Saint Augustine has given us the equivalent of this Persian tale in one crisp phrase: *"Amo quia est."* No partner to marriage for whom this sentiment is not the dominant note is emotionally qualified for marriage. "I love her because she is." There is no reason for love short of this. The example for married love is set in the way Christ loves the Church: not because it is good, for it is not; not for what it can become, because he loves it fully now and his present love makes its future possible; but for no reason at all—simply because it is. No other love is free. There is no other love. "O you that are married! It means nothing to say: Love one another with a natural love: two turtle doves make such

love. Nor does it mean anything to say: Love one another with a human love: the heathen have well practiced such love. I say to you with the great apostle, 'Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church.' And you wives, love your husbands as the Church loveth her Savior" (Francis de Sales in *Introduction to the Devout Life*).

Another source of crisis in marriage is *an unrealistic view of love.* It is unrealistic to expect that the same sensations surrounding love in courtship will continue in marriage. The love one experiences in courtship is usually a highly romanticized kind of love. For every part of reality in it, there are five parts of fantasy. Jean Giraudoux's play, *Ondine,* recently made this clear to Broadway audiences. In the play a knight meets a water sprite and marries her. The unfolding of the drama is the story of the problems involved in so amphibious a marriage. New York audiences enjoyed the fantasy but did not quite see the point of it all. They did not understand that every marriage is in some sense the wedding of a knight to a sprite. He thinks she is a sprite and she thinks he is a knight, and that romantic moment when sealed by the covenant of marriage threatens to unravel in a story of disillusionment and faded ideals. While the moment of marriage is a highly romantic moment, we do not marry the moment. That moment is ephemeral and cannot endure. As Maurice Valency, the adapter of *Ondine,* commented (*New York Times,* Feb. 14, 1954):

> It marks perhaps the acme of our existence, but we do not marry this moment. Beautiful as it is, it is relatively useless. It does not cook. It does not bear children. It does not help us with our sums or entertain our business acquaintances. We need another woman for that, we need Bertha. This is our dilemma. As men, we love Ondine always, but Bertha is indispensable. We take Ondine into our arms, hoping to find Bertha; we marry Bertha, loving Ondine. And so at every moment we deceive them the one with the other—it is our destiny. And in the end, between them, they destroy us.

The dilemma destroys us, of course, only when we refuse to see the difference between romantic love and married love. Henry James also writes of this theme in his short story, *Madame de Mouvrais.* A woman is married to an unfaithful and abusive drunkard. But to the wonderment of all her friends and neighbors she seems to remain loyal to him. Then one day the husband is miraculously transformed. He conquers the habit of drinking, he settles down into reliability, and he is ready to love his wife again. But she cannot receive his love. It comes about that it is not he she has loved during all this time. She married the romantic ideal and it is that which she now loves. That ideal comes between her and her husband as vividly as an intrusive stranger.

Love and marriage go together like a horse and carriage. But when the love of courtship is hitched to the carriage of marriage, it becomes a horse of a different color. One who does not know that is headed for

critical days. "Love," as Balzac has put it in *The Magic Skin,* "is like some fresh spring, that leaves its cresses, its gravel bed and flowers, to become first a stream and then a river, changing its aspect and its nature as it flows to plunge itself in some boundless ocean." Part of the thrill of romantic love is its sheer freedom of escape. Like the fresh spring, it can still decide where it will make its permanent bed. Married love is the end of such freedom, and only mature souls find its boundless ocean a place of endless contemplation. Those who marry the romantic moment find only monotony on the boundless ocean of marriage.

The Russian philosopher, Nicolas Berdyaev, has done modern marriage a service by reintroducing the androgyn myth. According to this myth which was employed by Plato and later by Jacob Boehme, the first man created was sexually complete, neither man (*andros*) nor woman (*gyne*), but both—an androgyn. How then did bisexuality arise? When man fell away from God, he fell apart, splitting into male and female. Sin, then, is at the root of bisexuality and holds the sexes apart. But the sexes were originally meant to be together, hence the longing of love. To explain the relation between men and women in marriage, two factors must be included and not simply one. There is the longing to be together which explains the attraction in love; but there is a continual wedging apart and resistance which accounts for the difficulty of maintaining married life solely at the level of attraction. It is only a myth, of course, and in some ways more fantastic than the *Ondine* story. But it is deeper. It stands over every love relation, beautiful as it is, with the warning that relations of attraction are constantly liable to subversion. Where that is not known and where one is not prepared to cope with it, marriage can be worn away by frustrated expectations and disillusionment.

A third factor in the crisis of marriage is *an unwholesome view of sex.* By unwholesome, of course, I do not mean vulgar, obscene, or cheap. By unwholesome I mean a view of sex which does not see love as a union of the flesh and the spirit. Any separation of spiritual commitment and physical expression makes love obscene. Man is a psychophysical totality. Nothing deeply spiritual can be experienced without at the same time being deeply physical. Not to know this is serious for marriage. Ignorance of it accounts for the injurious expression of sexual love both inside and outside of marriage.

How does it affect marriage relations? When the spirit is allowed to be separated from the flesh in marriage, either of two things can happen. Either sexual fear enters to wilt desire and thwart the love act, or sexual desire enters to fan the sparks of love into flames which consume. When the flesh is separated from the spirit it gives the flesh an opportunity to look in upon the spirit in the love act. "What!" says the flesh, "express an eternal love through a momentary physical act?" And in that moment the spirit feels foolish and comical. Now no one can love when he feels laughed at. The sense of being comical wilts desire and freezes passion.

But this is the effect of separating the flesh from the spirit. It produces a condition that makes for monasticism in marriage. St. Augustine once said that "freedom from sexual intercourse is angelic exercise both here and hereafter." But man is no angel. Angels are disembodied spirits. Man is nothing without his flesh. And love is nothing when it is not communicated through the flesh. The theologian, Schleiermacher, believed he could make love by correspondence. That kind of monasticism in love is for the angels. The only kind of love that satisfies the whole man is the love which actualizes itself in the meeting of skin against skin, a meeting in such proximity that one has virtually made a covenant by mixing blood.

Lust in marriage is just as unwholesome as abstinence. When the spirit is separated from the flesh the spirit is in the position where it can look in upon the flesh. The spirit becomes a peeping Tom and causes the flesh to sense its nakedness. The feeling of being looked in upon causes embarrassment and the sense of shame. But embarrassment causes the desires to exceed themselves in passion. Passion makes sexual pleasure an end in itself, depersonalizing the object of one's love into a sex object and curtaining off the core of love which is the spiritual commitment. This is what the Protestant pietist, Zinzendorf, meant when he said, "Right marriage is achieved only where lust is overcome."

Some views of marriage attempt to overcome this dichotomy between fear and desire, between abstinence and lust, by a kind of synthesis of the two. In this view the sexual pleasure associated with lust is regarded as the incentive for entering into a relationship whose real vindication is the propagation of children. But beyond that function no other sexual role can be endorsed. Sex is to the human race what food is to the individual: the very basis of our continued existence. Thomas Aquinas suggested that in both cases hunger is the incentive. In his colorful and Thomistic way, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen said, in a sermon in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, "The two most important duties of human-kind are eating and propagating the human species." "The pleasure" connected with each, he went on to say, was given "by Almighty God as bait, an inducement for fulfillment of a duty," namely, the propagation of the species (as reported in the *New York Times,* February 26, 1951). When the same sermon on "The Dark Night of the Body" appeared in his book, *Three to Get Married,* the statement was softened, but the same old lines were showing: "The honeymoon precedes the labors of birth, and is a credit God extends in advance because of the responsibilities involved" (p. 252). Bishop Sheen has called this view of sex the "frosting on the cake" view. It is based upon the supposition that the flesh and the spirit are separable, hence it is an unwholesome view of sex which virtually authorizes lust in marriage if the lust serves the ends of childbirth. If one must talk about rewards at all, it would seem that Otto Piper's suggestion is su-

perior. It is childbirth, he says, that is the "bonus" for the sex act, not *vice versa.*

A wholesome view of sex regards the physical act of making love as the visible sign of an invisible spiritual commitment. Childbirth need not even enter the consideration. Sexual love is a spiritual duty (1 Cor. 7:5). As Francis de Sales has said:

> Love and fidelity joined together always produce familiarity and confidence. This is why the saints have used many reciprocal caresses in their married life, caresses truly affectionate, but chaste, tender, and sincere. Thus, Isaac and Rebecca, the most chaste married couple of antiquity, were seen through a window caressing one another in such manner that, though there was no immodesty, Abimelech was convinced that they must be man and wife.

Now a really critical question remains for those who are in the situation that has not yet jelled. If deep love must be sexually expressed in marriage, why is it not allowable outside of marriage? I could give you many practical reasons, but I am not your parent. Furthermore, you know these reasons already and none of them is good enough. Let me give you a theological reason. It will not be good enough, either, if you insist on living in defiance of your destiny which is to be in the image of God. Premarital love is romantic love which is uncommitted. Like the fresh stream, it still has the option to determine the bed which will thereafter define its boundaries. In marriage, however, as Paul the Apostle has said, quoting Genesis, "the two shall become one flesh" (Epl. 5:31; 1 Cor. 6:16). This makes of marriage "a full communion of life," to use the words of Karl Barth. The sex act is the realization of full communion. It is a penetration of two selves so intimately that their lives are thereafter indistinguishable. That is why one who breaks that relationship through infidelity dies (Lev. 20:10). As Calvin has said, in commenting on this Biblical attitude, "Whoever divorces his wife tears himself in pieces because such is the force of holy marriage that the husband and wife become one person." Cut marriage in two, and you do not have two pieces, a man and a woman; you have four: a split-in-two man and a split-in-two woman. You do not have two living parts of what was before a single whole. You have four fragments of what could only live while one. Man is the kind of worm who cannot wiggle out of his divorce alive. In premarital love the joy of love is still separable from its responsibility. Marriage ends that separation. Thereafter, one finds his joy only within his responsibility.

Monogamy is indicated for the same reason that an extramarital sex life is not. The King of Siam notwithstanding, it is just as bad for a bee to go from flower to flower as for a flower to go from bee to bee. Most of the reasons adduced for this are faulty because they are cultural prejudices with strong pragmatic and pietistic overtones. The New Testament has only one reason. In married love, two bodies become one body. This

happens when God copulates with the people of Israel, and it happens when Christ makes the Church his bride. Marriage is this same kind of unique relation. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" for the same reason that "thou shalt have no other Gods." The sex act is not a mere merging of genitals, then. It is the total identification of oneself with another. One cannot totally identify himself with *two* others.

You may think it odd, then, that I would move from this insistence on the uniqueness of marriage to this fourth situation productive of marriage crisis. I believe that *the legalistic attitude toward divorce* militates against sound marriage. But do not misunderstand. I have not said divorce is theologically permissible. I have said that the prohibition of divorce is hostile to the best interests of marriage. But in so qualifying my position I do not intend to abandon the role of theologian for that of social analyst, and I do not intend to step outside the question of the personal crisis to introduce the question of marriage as a social institution. I simply mean to say that the strict legal prohibition of divorce creates hardships in marriage of a sort that theological understanding need not endorse.

Divorce laws, like all public legislation, keep order in what might otherwise be a chaotic situation in the institution of marriage. But psychologically insensitive divorce laws force couples to live together under conditions of "incompatibility." This is scarcely a meaningless term to those who have made every honest and intelligent effort to negotiate their marriage beyond incompatibility but only in the cruelest kind of failure. But the divorce laws throw a net around the couple and say they must perpetuate their torment. In so doing, they encourage the clandestine affair, the slipping-out of the net to find their love "illicitly."

Now Jesus was unalterably opposed to divorce. He allowed no exceptions. The exemption in the case of adultery is an editorial softening of Jesus' absolute requirement. But this is not all Jesus has had to say about marriage relations. He was just as unalterably opposed to looking on a woman lustfully. There are no laws about that. Of course the law would have a desperate time controlling the imagination. And who of us would want it to! That's just the point. As Luther said, "You can't keep crows from flying over your head; you can only keep them from nesting in your hair." Or as my favorite radio announcer asked one morning: "Why is a wolf like a railroad train? Answer: You like to hear the whistle even if you're not going anywhere."

But Jesus reacted with mercifully good humor in the presence of the woman taken in adultery. He stopped the stoning. But it wasn't the stoning he was against. It was the unyielding character of the moral evaluation implied in the event. Jesus stooped to write in the sand, possibly sketching the outline of the tablet of the law, a sign that the one who shared its authorship should know how to interpret it. Then he

turned on the men and not on the woman: "He that is without sin cast the first stone." What did he mean? He had already made it clear in his interpretation of the law. "He that committeth adultery in his *heart*. . . ." That included them all. But he did not condemn them. And he turned to the woman saying, "Neither do I condemn *thee*. Go and sin no more." The Christian Church is as much the steward of this mercy as it is of radical demands.

This of course leads us to the final situation to be considered here, the situation of *irresponsibility*. To quote the Frenchman, Charles Peguy, "And now abideth liberty, equality, and fraternity; but the greatest of these is fraternity." Why is fraternity greater than either liberty or equality? Because you can legislate for liberty and equality, but fraternity is a spiritual thing which can only be realized deep within the person. Marriage as a social institution can be shored up from the outside by political and ecclesiastical law. But the spiritual crisis in marriage cannot be legislated out of existence. Marriage is built upon responsibility, and you cannot coerce responsibility if in fact the conditions for the ability to respond to another in faithful love are not present.

Statistical reports on sex practices in marriage are highly informative. They are limited, however, to the question of how sex is expressed; they never discuss the responsibility involved in the expression of sex. Statistics about the increasing divorce rate are alarming enough to attract the attention of parliaments and congresses, but political bodies are helpless in the presence of the divorce problem simply because, as Rudolf Bultmann has said, "He who divorces his wife has not understood that marriage requires of him a complete decision."

Marriage obligates two people to love each other irrevocably. When two young people appear before the altar of a church for holy matrimony, does the minister ask them, "Are you in love?" He does not! He asks them, "*Wilt* thou love. . . .?" Married love is resolute love, responsible love, love shot through with decisiveness and fidelity. But what if one or both parties to the marriage lacks the spiritual mobility to assume that kind of irrevocable responsibility? Irresponsible persons turn the ceremoney of marriage into a mock wedding. They *say* they will do what they lack the ability to do.

Visualize yourself being married to a resigned type of person. You cannot. He (or she) rarely allows himself to form such final attachments. But visualize yourself married to a rebellious type. His (or her) life is dominated by the need to dominate. His guilt sense is expressed by blaming others. If he is a believer, he is fanatical about his belief. If he is a doubter, he needs his doubts as a proof that he is too strong to need a faith. He will love you; and he may love only you; but he will love you with the passion of one who feels all womanhood is coming under his power through his love of you. Or he may not love you constantly. Love

feelings are rarely constant in marriage. But the love feelings of the rebellious are broken up by the curious projection of guilt upon the object of one's love which makes that one seem unworthy of love and, in the moment where love is expected, causes him to turn away. That is the picture of irresponsibility in marriage: the inability to respond with genuine love to the partner in marriage.

Or picture yourself married to a recessive type. His (or her) life is dominated by the need to be dominated. His guilt sense is expressed by the constant blaming of himself. If he is a believer, he is irresolute and insecure about his faith. If he is a doubter, he needs his doubt as a rationalization of his sense of unworthiness for a faith. He will love you, and only you. But when he loves you, you get the impression there is no reciprocity. He is only allowing you to ravish him. It is as if you are not his love but his punishment. Or he may not love you constantly. And why, at the moment of love opportunity, does he turn away so inexplicably? Not because he does not care for your love, but because he does not feel worthy of it. He lacks the conditions within himself for a responsible and reciprocal love life in marriage.

According to the Protestant church, marriage is not a sacrament. It really ought to be, however. If it is not, then it needs the help of the sacraments. For a sacrament is a means of grace. The sign of a sacrament is the visible communication of God's invisible forgiveness of our sins. No marriage can be fully responsible which does not die and rise with Christ in the holy baptism of the God relation and which is not continually nurtured at the Supper of Our Lord. For no man who cannot accept himself can wholly accept or give himself to another in responsible marriage. The knowledge of who God is and who you therefore are, communicated as it is through the ministry of the church, undergirds marriage with the spiritual ingredients which make interpersonal responsibility possible. Accepted by God, one can accept himself. When one can accept himself, he can receive the love of others and reciprocate with love. Without that spiritual acceptance, marriage may remain precariously cracked. One need not be without it. For the blood of Christ can be the glue of marriage.

Interfaith marriages are ill-advised chiefly for this reason. When I say "interfaith" marriages, I do not mean marriages between Baptists and Methodists! I mean non-ecumenical marriages. Two persons who become one in marriage often find that the one force in life which should nurture their unity really only pulls them apart. Split faiths split marriages. Now couples often solve this dilemma by omitting the consideration of faith entirely from their marriage. This is tantamount to saying you can know each other in the intimacies of marriage without knowing yourself. Your faith tells you who you are and saves you from the self-destructive devices which result from not knowing and from fabricating a recognizable facade for your life. Marriages which are non-religiously based are marriages not so much of persons as of the masks of persons.

Under these conditions married life may be, as one says, a real ball; but it is a masked ball. How easy it is, then, to leave one mask and take up with another. But your faith identifies you, gives you a name, and binds you indissolubly to another, all the while providing the adhesive properties for responsible constancy.

Homosexuality, the most poignantly painful and miserably misunderstood of all the human problems, is basically a problem of irresponsibility. Persons who do not enjoy their bisexuality are called homosexuals. This should mean that homosexuality is not a difference in kind between people; it is a difference in degree. The Kinsey report helped to make that clear when it revealed how large a proportion of married men and women continue even within marriage to enjoy homosexual practices. A homosexual lacks the ability to respond with complete pleasure to a member of the opposite sex. For some as-yet-unexplored reason, he prefers companionship with his own sex, and holds the other sex off at a safe distance.

By that description, how is he essentially different from men and women who enjoy bisexuality but nonetheless hold the opposite sex off at a safe distance? Readers of pornographic literature, patrons of burlesque, daydreamers who reconstruct in their waking hours the lurid scenes invented during their sleeping hours—what are these but devices for holding off at safe distance erotic involvements which would be pleasurable were they not so fraught with responsibility? There is something so impersonal, so *incognito,* so distant about a chorus girl singled out from a line of curvatious but unknown bodies—and so safe. Married people can be so attractive to unmarried people for the same reason: their marital involvement is insulation against your likelihood of involvement. You can enjoy the pleasures of the imagination without going outside yourself in the responsible commitment of marriage. Or even within the married relation, you can find yourself caressing your lover in erotic passion and suddenly discover that you feel the sensation in your own finger-tips; but you do not feel the skin of the other. Married love can be as irresponsible as masturbation, even when the acts of bisexuality are being performed. Which is to say that homosexuality can exist in a degree even within bisexually capable people, because homosexuality is an inability to respond fully to a member of the opposite sex.

Irresponsibility is never something to be condemned. Society may be forced to fence it off at times for the public safety, but even society knows there is no future in fences. Irresponsibility is something to be cured. The Christian faith diagnoses irresponsibility as the inability of a man to respond faithfully to his obligations toward others. As Augustine put it, if we have fallen out of the creator's hands, we have broken in pieces. We cannot pull ourselves together for the wholesome response to life which such situations as marriage require of us. But that is why marriage is a triangular affair with God at the apex. It takes three to get married in any finally responsible sense. Accepted by God, we begin to become

aware of the conditions of self-acceptance which help us to accept others. Without that acceptance, we live in the constant effort to camouflage and rationalize our social ineptitude. With it, we are on the way to being liberated for open and wholesome responsibility.

That is why the columnist in a western newspaper was wrong to compare a marriage with the building of a New England town meeting house. The particular town voted to build a new town hall. But they consented to go on meeting in the old town hall while the new was being built. This is *not* what happens in marriage. Something new is added. Into the materials of two lives, God introduces his reconciling grace. That grace is not a buttress thrown up as from the outside which holds up the walls of marriage when the walls are unable to stand by themselves. It is a glue from within, providing the conditions of personal responsibility by which two persons adhere to each other in willing faithfulness.

THE EVOLUTION OF A MINISTERIAL COUNSELING CENTER

ROBERT B. DEITCHMAN, M.D.

Psychiatrist in Private Practice and Assistant in the Department of Psychiatry at Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri

In his presidential address before the American Psychiatric Association in April 1956, Dr. Finley Gayle spoke of the growing rapport between the professions of psychiatry and religion and called for the formation of a section within the Psychiatric Association dedicated to religion and psychiatry.[1] Another movement indicative of recognition of the interrelationship of the fields of psychiatry and religion is the National Academy of Religion and Mental Health, which was incorporated in July 1954. By January 15, 1957, the membership of this group was reported to be 1600. Harvard University has appointed a Director of the National Institute of Mental Health Projects to develop a curriculum and teaching methodology in relationships between religion and mental health. The place of the psychiatrically oriented chaplain has become secure in the accredited modern psychiatric hospital and correlated therapeutic efforts of psychiatrist and chaplain are commonplace in hospital practice.

The study presented here is concerned with the evolutionary processes which have occurred as psychiatrist-minister correlated activities have been extended into a metropolitan community. As this group of ministers and psychiatrists have worked together on specific cases they evolved a coordinated organization which has become a ministerial counseling center, nonsectarian, psychiatrically oriented, and available to the community at large.

The Metropolitan Church Federation in St. Louis is an organization composed of over one thousand Protestant churches (approximately 650 in 1954, when the counseling center was organized) for the purpose of coordinating community efforts and mutually assisting in meeting common

---

Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in Chicago, May, 1957.

Mrs. Emily Johnston and Mrs. Betty Parsons have worked tirelessly and anonymously not only as the dedicated volunteers described in this paper, but also in collecting the data presented and in following up cases in progress.

[1] R. Finley Gayle, Jr., Presidential Address before the Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Chicago, April 30, 1956.

needs. Several years ago the Committee on Religion and Health of this organization had visualized its objective as the provision of a chaplain for each hospital. The presence of chaplains in several of the larger hospitals with psychiatric divisions served as a stimulus to both ministerial and medical membership of the Committee on Religion and Health. It was evident to both groups that the trained chaplain contributed significantly to therapy of many patients. It also became evident that trained ministerial counselors could aid in both prevention and rehabilitation of many cases. The problem of training ministers in the recognition of psychopathology and technique of counseling was approached initially by the use of seminars. For two years series of seminars were conducted by psychiatrist-minister teams who attempted in an organized manner to present the more common psychopathologic problems seen by the minister, together with appropriate technical approaches. Clinical case material presented by the participating group of ministers was used as teaching material. As ministers completed these seminar courses, termed by the Federation "in-pastoral training," they became increasingly aware of both congregation problems and individual need for counseling guidance in specific cases. A counseling center organized in an accessible, centrally located church was considered to offer the most practicable solution to these problems.

A survey of the problems with which the minister was most frequently consulted as a counselor indicated that these most frequently centered around marital interpersonal conflicts and adjustments. It was evident that emphasis upon this group of ministerial counseling problems would furnish adequate teaching material for the pastoral in-training program and, at the same time, meet an evident need of the community.

The organization of the Ministerial Counseling Center has remained under the jurisdiction of the non-sectarian Metropolitan Church Federation but the physical location of the site of the Center has necessarily been in one of the participating churches, central and accessible in location, with adequate and appropriate physical facilities. Here the Pilgrim Congregational Church volunteered its excellent facilities.

In September 1954 the Ministerial Counseling Center was opened and has operated continuously since. Not all operations have been smooth nor have all the preconceptions been verified. In the empirical course of experience a practical solution to most of the technical problems has evolved and our presentation here is of the current solutions.

The mechanical operation of the Ministerial Counseling Center requires consideration of the following: (1) The physical facilities for the Center and time of operation; (2) The administrative-clerical personnel and procedures; (3) referral and counselee appointment procedures; (4) minister counselors; (5) psychiatrist as consultant and supervisor; (6) staff conference facilities and procedure; (7) follow-up and referral procedures directed by Staff Conference. Each of these seems simple and ob-

vious but, in our experience, each has posed problems of various types and some solutions have been improvised from necessity rather than upon theoretical concepts. The physical facilities of the Center require, in addition to accessibility of location, facilities for the reception of counselees, adequate administrative facilities for intake data and record maintenance. Individual offices for each counselor permit requisite privacy. We have used a fairly large reception room, attended by a reception clerk who also assists in answering telephones, as guide and information center. In actual practice we have used young men from a local seminary who are the only paid personnel in the Center. The administrative and record office adjoins the reception room. We have available twelve offices or conference rooms and use a small library for staff conference after each counseling session. Counseling sessions are one hour in length. Administrative clerical details are equally abhorrent to ministers and psychiatrists but in practice we have found them to be necessary integrations. The administration of the Center became satisfactory only when it was placed in the competent hands of an intelligent, interested volunteer. We have been impressed with the value of the interest of this key person and suggest that in this position the combination of intelligence and interest in the volunteer worker out-weigh technical training with preconceived ideas. The Administrative Director of the Center schedules appointments, assigns cases, registers counselees, maintains case record data, attends staff conferences and makes the referrals, appointments, or reports as directed by the staff conference. As each new counselee is registered in the Center a small token registration fee is collected by the Administrative Director. She may waive this fee, if she feels this to be indicated.

Counselees are referred, as will be indicated below, from various sources. We have found it most practicable to have all such referrals channeled through the business office of the Metropolitan Church Federation. A secretary on duty during business hours accepts calls or letters and specific appointments are made by the Administrative Director of the Center. The initial appointment is confirmed by telephone the day of the appointment by the Administrative Director.

The minister-counselors were initially envisaged as those who had completed one or more years of pastoral in-training seminar instruction. Generally this is the group who comprise the working minister-counselors but in the community many ministers have had some training or experience in this field. The Center has served as an opportunity for post-graduate internship type of training. Because the Center serves the community as well as a ministerial counseling training center, those qualified, trained minister-counselors in the community serve from time to time upon call from the office of the Administrative Director. In general six to eight weekly counseling sessions are served by each minister. The Administrative Director of the Center assigns cases to the minister-counselors at the time the initial appointments are made with the counselee. An assistant

to the Administrative Director maintains a list of available ministers for the Administrative Director and on the day of the counseling session for which the minister is scheduled contacts him by telephone advising him of the time of his appointments. The administrative confirmation of appointments with both counselors and counselees on the day of the appointment has prevented "missed appointments" by both groups. In voluntary organizations this last is frequently a significant problem.

The function of the psychiatrist has been that of consultant, counseling supervisor, and staff conference advisor. As consultant, the psychiatrist assists in differentiating treatment from counseling problems. The Ministerial Counseling Center is not a medical organization and the psychiatrist has the responsibility of differentiating the treatment case from that requiring counsel and guidance. As counseling supervisor, the psychiatrist reviews each counseling session with the minister, attempts to clarify the implications of the data and advises as to the course of future sessions. The psychiatrist has the usual responsibilities of the instructor and case supervisor with the minister-counselor. Individual cases may be interviewed by the psychiatrist if this appears to be indicated at any time. The staff conference which follows each counseling session is presided over by a minister appointed for three-month periods by the Metropolitan Church Federation. The psychiatrist assists the Staff Conference Director and advises upon each case presented. If the psychiatrist considers a case to require medical or psychiatric treatment, appropriate referral is made in the staff conference. As a matter of operating procedure as well as in emulation of Caesar's wife, the referral of such cases may be to any qualified psychiatrist other than the psychiatric consultant making the recommendation.

The staff conference which follows each counseling session is essentially the format of psychiatric staff conferences in which each new case is presented and each case in counseling is reviewed. Discussion is general and the psychiatrist advises upon the basis of the presentation and the available data. Decisions or recommendations reached at the staff conferences are recorded by the Administrative Director and by the minister-counselor concerned. The Administrative Director accomplishes the referrals, correspondence, or other directives of the staff conference. Case presentation by the minister-counselor is clarified by the use of a data guide in a modified form of the usual medical history.

In a metropolitan setting the problem of follow-up on cases becomes complex at times. The aim of the Center has been to avoid paper work and red tape. Telephone calls are substituted for letters and every effort is made to avoid complicating what may be essentially simple. We have found, however, that by following up the Counseling Center service by bringing the counselee and his minister and church into a better living relationship, the benefits of the church community are attained in most cases. In some instances the minister of the counselee is asked to the

Center and the case reviewed with him so that he and the church community may become a part of the total program of what may be termed rehabilitation. We have been surprised to find that sometimes church members feel they do not belong because they have not been invited.

The present study is concerned with the first 200 complete case records from this center, with review of the data presented, together with personal observations. The data indicate the source of the case material, the type of case material seen by the center, the manner in which this particular center has handled these problems, together with, parenthetically, the problems, trials, successes, and failures which this center has found along the way.

The source of the case material has been somewhat diffuse. Ninety-one of the cases were referred to the center by ministers, most of whom were members of the Metropolitan Federation of Churches, and who referred cases in their own church membership or from their immediate communities for a variety of reasons. Thirty referrals represented an interesting group of persons who were referred by others who had previously consulted the Center and who recommended it to friends who were having similar troubles as being "a place to get help." It will be of considerable interest to those working at the Center to observe whether this proportion of "satisfied customers" continues. The local newspaper columns and social agencies also referred a number of cases and represented a scattering of variable sources of case material.

The reasons for the referral of cases to the Center represented a somewhat "loaded" type of material since the Center has indicated to referring agencies and individuals its concern primarily with marital problems. It was not, therefore, too remarkable that 112, or slightly over half, of the first 200 cases presented themselves to the Center with primarily marital problems as a presenting complaint or difficulty. The concern of each of these 112 cases was almost identical; all were interested in obtaining assistance in preserving a marriage, or in overpowering problems which were chronic within the marriage or family unit producing some form of significant disharmony. Twenty-one, or approximately 10 per cent, of those cases who presented themselves at the Counseling Center came because of "nervousness and tension" relating to their individual life-patterns. Sixteen cases, or approximately 7 per cent, of those referred to the Center came because of behavior which was disturbing to the community. There were 33 persons who came to the Center with a variety of concerns primarily relating to that of decisions and the general conduct of life. Approximately 5 per cent, or nine of those who consulted the Center in those first 200 cases seen, came because of a stated desire to receive help in overcoming alcoholism. There were nine persons who consulted the Center who had no specific presenting complaint but vaguely indicated that in some manner they felt they needed help. It is not evident from the records reviewed, nor is it evident in reviewing the cases individually, as to the

exact motivating cause or force in each of these cases. It is noted, however, that these almost uniformly represented extremely lonely, insecure people who were "clutching for help." The requests for premarital counseling were channeled to the minister of the applicant's church and are not included in this group, this screening having been accomplished prior to putting such cases into a counseling situation. It was the belief of those concerned that premarital counseling is best accomplished by the minister of the appropriate church rather than the more impersonal Counseling Center.

The persons seen by the Center have been almost uniformly adult; the oldest was 67; the youngest, 16. The median age of the entire group is 37.5 years. One hundred and twenty were women and 80 were men. One hundred and forty-two, or almost three-fourths, of those seen were married. The income of the clientele seen by the Center was usually that of the lower groups, although some in the middle income brackets, and on a few occasions those of considerable wealth, were seen. Ministers and their families are in this group, as are physicians and their families. While it was difficult to determine the religious life and background of the individuals who came to the Counseling Center, it is significant that over 50 per cent of the cases were referred by ministers, which indicates a close liaison between the individuals and their church, although they could not seek help from the particular referring minister.

Of the 200 cases considered in the present study, 11 are still in the process of counseling, whereas 189 cases have been closed or completed. Of these 189 closed cases, 106 were seen in more than one session, 83 having been seen only once. Of the 83 cases who were seen only once, 32 were greatly disturbed cases who were in need of psychiatric care or intensive and extensive social assistance. Of these 200 cases, it is of interest to note that 110 of them felt that they had received some measure of help at the Counseling Center. Of these 110, 77 were clearly assisted as was indicated on the data in their records, the reports of the persons concerned, and the conclusions of the conferences in their particular cases.

Thirty-two individuals among the first 200 case records reviewed were screened by the consulting psychiatrist, at the request of the counseling minister. The consulting psychiatrist used, as a differentiation between the need for treatment and counseling, an empirical rule that "therapy was that form of treatment required by those individuals who were emotionally disturbed and considered ill; counseling as that guidance that may and perhaps well should be within the framework of faith, giving to the individual assistance in revising certain behavior patterns for more successful adaptation." Twenty-three of the 32 individuals seen and judged by this rule were referred to private psychiatrists for care. The remaining nine individuals who were interviewed were referred to the psychiatric clinic of one of the two medical schools in the St. Louis metropolitan area. Perhaps more psychopathology might have been exposed with more sys-

tematic screening, but it was felt this would deprive the minister of the very training experience the Center hoped to provide.

One of the pertinent observations made is in the number of hours spent in counseling as compared to the results obtained. Haddock and Mensh have reported on a survey of those seeking psychiatric aid from two student health centers and a veteran contract mental hygiene clinic. "About two-thirds (65%) of the patients were seen fewer than five hours."[2] At the Counseling Center 106 clients were seen for an average of 3.3 hours. Ninety-five of these received less than four hours of counseling with a favorable response. Ten were seen more than four hours with a favorable response. Eighty-three cases were considered to represent unsatisfactory results. Of these unsatisfactory response cases, 71 were seen less than four hours; 12 were seen more than four hours. It is evident that counseling returns diminish with expenditures of much more than four hours of effort.

In the evolution of the Center it was interesting to note the various reactions of patient, minister, and physician. It was apparent that a working knowledge of psychopathology was imperative for those who wished to do counseling. It was well to discuss the material and to present case material, but it was only in the actual process of doing the counseling and being exposed to the psychopathology that the counselor gained in technique and attained skill. Nowhere is it more apparent than within this unique set-up that merely having the office of minister does not qualify for the task of counseling. It has been gratifying to observe ministers develop techniques of counseling and sensitivity to psychopathologic processes in both counselees and themselves in this internship setting. An occasional minister has been wholly authoritarian in his relationship with his counselee. At times an individual minister has viewed the individual not as one with a problem, but as a transgressor. We have been interested in observing the gradual "discovery" of individual ministers of the similarity of psychiatric "acceptance" and the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. Exploration of the church community as a group support appears to warrant further psychiatrist-minister correlated efforts.

In summary, this report has been presented to show the evolution of a ministerial counseling center in a metropolitan center, sponsored by a federation of more than 1000 Protestant churches. Of the 200 case records reviewed, 110 were considered to have been assisted. Approximately four hours of counseling is required for each case. Thirty-two of the first 200 cases were in need of psychiatric treatment. The Ministerial Counseling Center in St. Louis has been found to provide a further area of training for the minister in that it has been under psychiatric supervision and has provided a form of counseling internship.

---

2 James N. Haddock and Ivan N. Mensh, in *Psychological Reports,* III (1957) 109-112.

One of the gratifying experiences of those working in this combined effort is that of the minister and psychiatrist working together. The minister reaffirms the socializing influence of the church. The psychiatrist confirms the awareness of the need within all to identify with the group.

From our experience in the Ministerial Counseling Center it would appear to serve well as a unifying, insightful workshop for the fields of theology, psychology, and psychiatry. It is certainly possible to conceive that in the future centers such as this one might be used not only for the ordained ministerial internships, but also for the seminarian in his training for understanding of pastoral psychology. The resident psychiatrist would find this type of experience of definite training value.

The over-all problem of preventive medicine, of mental health and mental stability for the community ranks now as one of our major goals of the future. The Ministerial Counseling Center has emphasized religion as an aspect of ego and community strength. The value of a religious outlook for mental health in later life has been emphasized by Jung.[3] The value of religious training and resultant concepts in personality structure has been previously emphasized. The use of ego support from the religious community has been emphasized in work at this Center.

From the mutual efforts of psychiatrist and minister have come mutual respects not previously evident.

Finally, we have been impressed with the significance of individual dedication in a long, tedious, tiresome volunteer effort. The Ministerial Counseling Center here reported has been of assistance to many who consulted it, to ministers who used it as a form of internship, to the community which it served, to the psychiatrists who learned from a new group experience, and perhaps to the young seminarian, the only paid member of the staff who earned a very few dollars in a very hard way, but none would have had any of these opportunities but for the prodigious efforts of the dedicated volunteers who have made this Center possible.

---

[3] Carl Jung: *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*

THE MINISTER AND THE PSYCHIATRIST AS A TEAM

HARRY G. GIANAKON, M.D.

Director of the Child Study Unit, University of Kansas Medical Center, and Associate Professor in Pediatrics and Psychiatry, University of Kansas

The majority in both professions have accepted the desirability of cooperation between the minister and the psychiatrist. They are both dedicated to the relief of human suffering in our present way of life[1] and to the understanding and development of new methods of living which will increase human happiness and creativity. Such common purpose is a basic prerequisite of "team" effort. Differences in background and training and differences in technique strengthen and give vital dimensions to a team, as long as the common denominator of purpose exists and is recognized by the team members. (The child guidance teams, composed of several disciplines, currently attest to the validity of such a concept.)

In actual practice, the willingness and interest of individuals to work as a team will largely determine the degree to which services of the different professions will be coordinated.[2]

The certain method of maintaining and promoting the willingness and interest of the different members of a clinical team is the continual involvement in the same clinical work and its problems. Theoretical and philosophical differences will be most swiftly and easily resolved when the minister and psychiatrist accept the responsibility for joint action against a common challenge. Through the study of such joint effort new understanding and effectiveness will evolve. This has prompted Gayle[3] to declare: "The *ways* of working most effectively together should be the object of our continuous and critical study and most conscientious endeavor."

Gardner[4] has indicated the growing need for clinical and case re-

This paper was delivered to the 113th Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, section on "Religion and Psychiatry," in Chicago on March 17th, 1957.

1 J. L. Liebman: *Peace of Mind;* New York, Simon and Schuster, 1946.

2 M. Krugman; "A Study of Current Trends in the Use of Coordination of Professional Services," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* XX (1950).

3 F. Gayle, "Presidential Address," *American Journal of Psychiatry,* CXIII (1956), 1.

4 G. E. Gardner, "Clinical Research in a Child Psychiatric Setting," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* XXVI (1956), 330.

porting rather than theoretical exposition, in the current framework of psychiatric development. This method is employed, here, to present the sequence of events when minister and psychiatrist formed a team—with common purpose and willingness—to assist individuals in emotional distress.

Case I

A 19-year-old Army private developed complete lower extremity paralysis on the day previous to his starting for a leave to his home town and family. He was admitted to the Fort Belvoir Army Hospital medical service. He remained on a medical ward for a period of three and one-half weeks. Complete laboratory and neurological examinations were performed and a diagnosis of hysterical paralysis was established. (The relative delay in diagnosis was occasioned by the disbelief of the medical officers that such an hysterical paralysis could develop just as the soldier was to embark on a leave to his home.) He was transferred to the psychiatric ward in June 1956, and the decision was made to remove his symptom as quickly as possible. Hypnosis and directly suggestive techniques were employed and he was mobilized into walking within a few days. His classic "belle indifference" quickly ended and he became extremely anxious and upset. During the initial treatment sessions, extreme regression was permitted and encouraged. The psychiatrist would stand several paces from him, with arms outstretched, encouraging him to walk, just as a parent dealing with a child initially mastering the ability to walk. After these sessions, the soldier would vehemently express his resentment of the psychiatrist to his fellow patients and ward staff. He would become violently angry and, on one occasion, announced his intention of killing the psychiatrist. His anger was so intense that it was obviously more than a reaction to the loss of face and secondary gain which he may have experienced in the ward setting.

As exploratory and investigative therapeutic interviews were initiated, he spoke of his extremely close relationship with his mother. The father had been a man not interested in his family living and the mother had turned her primary attention to the patient, her handsome, oldest son. During the boy's puberty, the father was seriously injured by a co-worker, during a brawl. The father, subsequently, died and the patient assumed the full role of family leadership. He was rescued from increasing social ineffectiveness by his enlistment into the Army. As this material was produced, he replaced his anger for the psychiatrist by a growing, positive relationship. However, he now angrily announced his intention of returning to his home to kill the man who had injured his father and who had not been punished. This was associated with intense guilt in his other productions and preoccupations. His tour of duty was about to be completed and he could not tolerate the return to the mother's home with its deep Oedipal connotations. A real danger existed that he would obey his

destructive impulses if only to create a situation which would prevent his return home.

The Protestant chaplain was consulted and apprised of the situation. The chaplain conducted individual prayer sessions with the patient in an effort to minimize the intense guilt and to offer him control of the violence of his emerging emotions. They prayed together, at the foot of the altar in the chapel. A reintegration of personality effectiveness occurred that was evident to all.

In addition, the chaplain effected a referral to a minister who lived in the patient's home town. The patient expressed his need for a minister who would personally assist him in making arrangements for further psychiatric care in the veterans' facilities of his home town. He recognized his need for some individual supervision and guidance during any waiting period that would precede his involvement in a new psychiatric relationship.

He was returned to duty and then discharged from the service in August 1956 under honorable conditions and at the termination of his period of enlistment. He voluntarily visited the Fort Belvoir hospital to tender his farewell and appeared to be functioning very satisfactorily.

Case II

A 22-year-old private was admitted to the Fort Belvoir psychiatric ward because of "inability to adjust to the Army setting." He was extremely anxious and ill at ease. He felt unable to make friends and acted as if he were a sophisticate who had been thrown into association with men much inferior to himself. Yet he experienced anguish in the everyday situations which repeatedly demonstrated, to him, his lack of true superiority. His company officers felt that he should be administratively separated from the service and complained bitterly of his ineptness and insolence.

A short series of psychotherapeutic interviews revealed his pathological relationship with his parents. He was constantly striving for their full approval, which he desperately needed, but, at the same time, he deeply resented his dependency and rebelled with insolence, behavior calculated to shock them, and inflexible denial of the things he felt were most vital in their way of life. This resulted in overwhelming feelings of loneliness and isolation.

The Jewish chaplain was asked for assistance. The chaplain spent several visits with the patient, thereby interpreting to him and reassuring him of a sustained and dedicated interest. The patient began to participate in an evening religious study group. Here, he was encouraged to display his considerable creativity and found an opportunity to display his knowledge and abilities. He gradually lost his sense of isolation and began to handle himself more realistically. He insisted on criticizing the chaplain,

the religious activity, the psychiatrist and hospital, but his increasing involvement was evident. Shortly after his return to duty, he expanded his religious participation by attending the services as well as the study groups.

Three months after his hospitalization, he won the honor of "General's Orderly," bestowed upon the person on the post who was judged to be the "best soldier of the month." He completed his tour of duty without further incident and voluntarily visited the hospital to extend his farewell and to report that he had made arrangements for further psychiatric care on his return to civilian life.

Case III

A 13-year-old girl was referred to the Fort Belvoir psychiatric clinic by her family. She was described as promiscuous, rebellious, incorrigible. Evaluation revealed that the mother was a very disturbed person who was projecting her own sexual fantasies onto the girl. She was experiencing grossly distorted sexual gratifications in her suspicions as to what she thought was happening to the girl. The mother drilled holes in the bathroom door so that she could continually check on the girl in whatever intimate activity she might be engaged.

When a treatment program was proposed, the mother became frightened and informed the clinic that she had made arrangements for the girl to receive counseling from the parish priest.

Some months later, an emergency situation arose when the girl experienced an acute dissociative episode, during which she made strong threats of violence against the mother. The girl was admitted to the Fort Belvoir hospital. Contact was made with a Jesuit priest at a nearby Catholic university and he made several visits to the hospital. He established a good rapport with the mother. He kept in close contact with the psychiatrist and understood the urgency of placing the girl away from home. The mother accepted the placement plan when it emanated from the priest. The priest also assisted in the selection of the proper facility and helped to implement the enrollment of the girl immediately. After several months, the clinic was notified that the youngster had made a good adjustment and seemed much happier and relieved.

Discussion

These cases are not presented as ideal models of what can or should be done, either psychiatrically or in the team collaboration of minister and psychiatrist. However, they do present what *was* done by willing and interested minister-psychiatrist teams. The actions resulted in bringing comfort and relief to emotionally distressed individuals and in preventing immediate spread of malignant processes to other people and situations. Within this limited framework of accomplishment it seems pertinent to

describe and discuss a few points characteristic of the team members and their joint effort.

In these reported case situations, both the ministers and psychiatrist regarded each other as an acceptable and definite resource for overall assistance to the patients. The ministers involved in these described cases had been mutually cooperative with the psychiatric clinic, previous to actual case involvement. They had participated in some clinic staff conferences and had presented descriptions of their work and problems. It became evident that the ministers and the clinic were often faced by similar situations. When this realization developed, it was natural that all concerned began to explore the idea of collaborative effort, so that more effective methods could be mastered. Of course, these meetings also established a more personalized image of each other for the ministers and psychiatrists. Many deductions as to individual strengths were made by both groups and served to make future requests more tangible and explicit than they would otherwise have been. This is the method by which any community resource must be evaluated. The psychiatrist and minister both utilize community resources and learn what particular strengths and uses a specific resource may have. (Psychiatric residency training stresses the importance of knowing about and utilizing treatment resources in a community in addition to the psychiatric interview. This is particularly stressed during the resident's child psychiatry rotation.[5] The use of these resources is encouraged and the psychiatric resident develops an appreciation of how beneficial such an approach can be in the management of a clinical problem. He learns to understand the team concept within the child psychiatric setting as well as the extension of that concept into other community resource agencies. Rarely, however, is opportunity presented to consider the minister in the community as a true resource. The cases presented here indicate what can be done if the minister is included as a fundamental resource for giving assistance to the emotionally ill person. Perhaps this is an area of education that can well be included in the psychiatric training program if the full potential of minister-psychiatrist collaboration is to be realized.)

As in any other successful team venture, participants must accept the responsibility of learning about each other's methods, abilities, and limitations. It is the psychiatrist's responsibility to present his knowledge to the team minister in an honest fashion, also to outline, as completely as he is able, the type of techniques that are being employed in a particular situation and what further needs are to be met. The minister, on the other hand, has an obligation to inform the psychiatrist of the religious methods he is honestly willing to offer. The psychiatrist can then validly determine the usefulness of these methods in a specific case situation.

Another principle of team collaboration is the practice of preliminary

---

[5] *The Psychiatrist, His Training and Development* (1952 Ithaca Conference), Washington, American Psychiatric Association, 1953.

thinking and planning before a cooperative venture is attempted. Lack of such practice produces amorphous and unexpected developments which foredoom the team effort to failure. Specific planning and the outlining of specific goals before the actual clinical effort are mandatory. The team members will not dissipate their energies in futile disagreements and anxieties if they are honestly prepared to decide, before undertaking the actual clinical work, such questions as: "What seems to actually be the matter with this person?" "What methods can I offer?" "How should I employ these methods, in this case?" The more structured this approach becomes, the more successful will be the outcome.

In the soldier with hysterical paralysis (Case 1), every attempt was made to answer such questions, previous to the collaborative effort. Greenacre[6] has observed that beginning religious atmosphere and preoccupation usually accompany the early childhood period of development "closely associated with relationship to the father." In the soldier, a suggestive and regressive type of therapy was conducted. Certainly, the initial oedipal situation was dramatically recreated, and the relationship to the father was stressed. It was at this stage, in therapy, that the referral to the minister was accomplished. The patient, as was true of the other patients cited, had reported church activity and early interest, during the social history and early evaluation. The problem for the psychiatrist was to determine the timing of the referral to the minister so that it would be most effective. The minister, aware of the hysterical nature of the patient's personality, structured his approach so that the dramatic needs of the patient could be constructively channeled. As the minister and soldier knelt together, at the foot of the altar, dynamic sources of strength were tapped that could be utilized in the restorative processes of the disturbed personality.

The close consultation and cooperation cannot end, once the specific roles and goals are determined. Both the minister and psychiatrist must continue to exchange detailed reports on the progress of the patient. They must both be sufficiently flexible that they can evolve modifications of the original plan, should this become necessary. Both must be sufficiently secure that they can accomplish these modifications without feeling threatened and insecure.

In the cases of the rebellious soldier (Case 2) and child (Case 3), unilateral action would have produced clinical failure. By continuing communication between ministers and psychiatrist, a dynamic program of treatment could develop. The understanding that a change in approach was not a sign of failure was an essential ingredient to team effort. Criticisms from the patients and their families could be used to guide the direction of treatment effort into more constructive approaches. The criticism was not employed in supporting the security operations of either

[6] P. Greenacre, "Experiences of Awe in Childhood," in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child;* New York, International Universities Press, 1956.

ministers or psychiatrist because neither felt threatened by the situation, but both felt mutually involved and responsible for the treatment.

Perhaps it is possible to draw some generalizations from what has been reported here. The training and work of these team members had produced confidence in the methods they utilized. From this confidence sprang a willingness for cooperation and collaboration with other professional persons whose training and development had imbued them with similar qualities. It would appear that, at this stage of initial exploration and evaluation, the training of both professions should be directed to the production of such skill and comfort in the practitioners that confidence can be established. Once this goal has been attained, there must be conscious effort to imbue in these professional persons a sense of collaboration with others who use different methods but who are dedicating themselves to common purposes. Also, there appears to be a need for the exploration of practical, clinical cooperation before attempts are made to evolve theoretical formulations and philosophical integrations. Both professions must be encouraged to report their actual experiences to each other and publicly to document both their successes and failures. A body of reference will then become available so that a standard measure can be produced and specific techniques developed.

Conclusion

If the minister and psychiatrist are willing to consider each other as valuable resources in a common purpose, they can make an extremely effective team in the treatment of emotional disturbance.

TRAINING OF EMPATHIC ABILITIES: A NOTE

THE REV. ORLO STRUNK, JR., PH.D.

Associate Professor of Psychology, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia

There appears to be little doubt that the clinical training of seminarians has become an accepted and generally laudable aspect of theological education. There is ample evidence that clinical pastoral training helps the student to become a better minister. However, this evidence is primarily anecdotal in nature. Indeed, practically all of the data accumulated to date are based on reports from the students receiving the training or from evaluations made by their supervisors.

Yet clinical pastoral training is but another technique or procedure designed better to educate the student, and, as such, it is not immune to objective evaluational studies. Every new educational approach sooner or later must stand the test of solid research. It appears that the clinical training movement is ready for such exposure.

The Problem of Empathy

Research problems are many and varied. It is probably uncomfortably close to the truth to say that in actuality we know practically nothing of what really takes place in the clinical setting. Just about any question one might wish to ask has not as yet been answered—at least, not answered in terms of systematic research. It is, therefore, somewhat arbitrary to suggest that the empathic response receive priority in research design. However, there are at least two reasons why empathy might be singled out as an ideal area for intense investigation.

Firstly, the empathic response[1] is a live area of study in psychological and social psychological sciences.[2] It has occupied a central position in the theoretical systems of such persons as C. H. Cooley, G. H. Mead, and H. S. Sullivan. L. S. Cottrell has referred to empathy as the "basic process" in all social interaction. Though there is much disagreement

[1] It would be nice if we could here offer a neat and cogent definition of empathy, but such is not available. For the sake of readability, let us consider empathy as the ability to "put one's self in the other person's place."

[2] Recently the author reviewed the literature dealing with the theory and research on empathy and came up with over one hundred items.

in the technical literature as to the nature of empathy, there is a general consensus that it is highly important in such areas as education, anthropology, prejudice, industry, psychotherapy, and counseling. It is here assumed that the empathic response must in some way play a salient part in the activities of the religious practitioner also.

Secondly, we have both the situation and the instruments to measure empathy. A brief description of available methods follows, but here it should be mentioned that the clinical pastoral training atmosphere affords an ideal situation for the study of empathy. It is difficult to conceive of an educational setting as ideally prone to face-to-face relationships as is the clinical setting.

Methods of Studying Empathy

A large portion of the technical literature dealing with empathy is concerned with measurement. Generally speaking, the two primary instruments are the self-other rating scale and the objective test type of measuring device.

Dymond was the first to propose a scale for measuring the empathic response in terms of self-other ratings. Details of her work may be found elsewhere.[3] Here we wish only to indicate the simplicity of the scale. If, for example, we wish to test two individuals (A and B) for their empathy with each other, the procedure would be as follows:

For "A":

1. A rates himself (A)
2. A rates B as he (A) sees him
3. A rates B as he thinks B would rate himself
4. A rates himself (A) as he things B would rate him

For "B": Simply place "B" wherever "A" appears in the above procedure, and "A" wherever "B" appears.

These ratings may be on a 5-point scale and may deal with such things as friendly-unfriendly, selfish-unselfish or whatever characteristics the researcher wishes to study.

To date many studies using this technique have been published; none, however, so far as the writer knows, has dealt specifically with the clinical setting in a religious context.

Two objective tests have been developed to measure empathy. The *Empathy Test*[4] is a simple paper-and-pencil test. The subject is asked

---

[3] Rosalind F. Dymond, "A Scale for the Measurement of Empathic Ability," *Journal of Consulting Psychology,* XIII (1949), 217-133.

[4] W. A. Kerr, and B. J. Speroff: *The Measurement of Empathy;* Chicago, Psychometric Affiliates, 1951.

to rank various areas according to a specified orientation. For example, the question, "What does the average American choose to read?" is followed by a listing of fifteen different popular magazines with the instructions that the subject rank them according to circulation. The subject's ranking is then compared with actual or true ranking, the differences yielding an empathy score. Reliability and validity studies on this test are especially good.

Recently Willard Kerr, author of the *Empathy Test,* has published another test called the *Primary Empathic Abilities.*[5] Though based on the same rationale underlying the *Empathy Test,* this one is more extensive and yields scores of greater subtlety. It measures empathy in terms of different areas or situations: empathizing expressively in face-to-face situations, with industrial urbanity, the insecure, the conscientious middle class, the lower middle class, the stable young married people, and the upper social levels.

Though there has been little validity research done on this test as yet, no great amount of imagination is needed to see how it might be used in studying empathic responses of ministers in a clinical setting. In fact, all of these instruments suggest great potential.

Research Questions

Research design and hypothesis-building are best left to the individual researcher, but there are certain questions which can be mentioned.

1. *Is empathy learned in the clinical setting?* Though many workers assume that the empathic response is amenable to training, there is actually little evidence available. Simple before-and-after studies of the clinical pastoral training experience should yield interesting data on this question.

2. *Are clergymen high on empathic ability more acceptable to the group than those low on empathic ability?* There is some evidence which indicates that selection of leaders rests on the empathic ability of the selected leader. Undoubtedly, in a summer program of clinical training, leaders are defined. Is empathy a significant variable determining this selection?

3. *Do ministers possess general empathic ability or do they find empathizing with specific groups easier?* For example, will some trainees find it easier to empathize with fellow clergymen than with the insecure (patients)?

4. *What part does the supervisor play in the learning of empathy?*

[5] W. Kerr: *Primary Empathic Abilities—Manual of Instructions;* Chicago: Psychometric Affiliates, 1957.

There are good indications that certain characteristics interfere with the exercising of empathic ability. What are some of the characteristics of a supervisor prone to produce high empathizers? Indeed, one might well ask, are the supervisors higher on empathic ability than the students? One study of the student-teacher interaction shows that students are better empathizers than teachers.[6] Does this hold with chaplain supervisors?

5. *What, if any, is the relationship between high or low empathizers and theological position?* Is the formalistic-doctrinal type ministerial student less empathic than the liberal-humanistic one?

These are but suggestions. Actually the field is wide open for research proposals. Certainly the clinical training situation affords ample opportunities to study the empathic response. Results should add to the general psychological literature, but, perhaps even more important, research findings should help formulate an evaluational philosophy which can guide the future development of the clinical pastoral training movement.

[6] An attempt is here being made to keep bibliographical data at a minimum. However, the author has prepared an annotated bibliography on empathy which is available on request, as long as the supply lasts.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED PASTORAL STUDIES: A NEW DEVELOPMENT

THE REV. REUEL L. HOWE, S.T.D.

Formerly Chairman of the Department of Pastoral Theology, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia; at present Director, Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

A group of laymen have underwritten, for an experimental period, an interdenominational establishment for advanced pastoral studies in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, which is designed to fill the post-ordination training needs of ministers. Its field of study will be a critical inquiry into the nature of the church's ministry as experienced in the various aspects of pastoral care, Christian education, parish administration, and community relations.

The present funds make possible a two-year experiment, which, if it proves successful, will lead to the permanent establishment of such a center. It is located for the time being at Cranbrook House in Bloomfield Hills. The first groups will include not more than twelve persons. The first conferences will be ten days long and will run from Monday through Wednesday of the following week. Attendance at each ten-day conference will be by invitation to clergy who have been in the ministry at least three years. Church leaders, seminary faculties, and clergy are being asked to recommend ministers who would be interested in and profit from such conferences. Interested clergy may apply directly. Scholarships are available for those needing aid.

The purposes are threefold: (1) to provide further training for ministers, especially the kind that would help them to learn from their own experience in the ministry; (2) to accumulate and make available to the whole church some of the creative work that many of the clergy are doing in their respective parishes; and (3) to try to heal some of the breaches in the spirit and life of the church by helping ministers understand anew the deeper purposes of the ministry.

The sessions are open to ministers of all denominations. Already there is evidence that, in spite of very real differences in doctrine and practice, a study of our common tasks and resources increases our understanding of one another and contributes to a sense of our unity in Christ.

Much is to be learned about the sphere of activity upon which the Institute enters. But the need which it hopes to fill is a real and pressing one, rooted in the realities of our life and times and broadly acknowledged as an unmet challenge.

Theological educators are aware of the need to make the training for the ministry even more adequate than it is. During the past twenty-five years, seminaries have been trying to adapt their courses of study to changing times and circumstances. But there are limits to the number and variety of objectives that can be included in a three-year course of study.

Numerous post-ordination training programs, including clergy conferences and refresher courses in the seminaries, have proved useful and successful. It has become quite clear that, because of their experience in the ministry, the clergy want, need, and readily profit from educational programs of this type. Thus, the founding of a center for advanced pastoral studies is a natural development of theological education. And it is logical that such a center would be dedicated to a still-undeveloped aspect of pastoral learning—training on the basis of actual experience in the ministry.

The curriculum of each conference will be determined in part by the clergy who attend and their interests and problems in the ministry. After the membership of each conference is completed, a questionnaire is sent to each man which helps him indicate the areas of study he would like to pursue while at the Institute. Thus the curriculum is tailor-made for each group.

The subject matter of a typical conference might include discussions and case studies of pastoral calling; ministering to the sick and dying, to older people, and to the bereaved; preparation for baptism, confirmation, and marriage; the principles and methods of counseling; counseling on marital and family problems; the life of the minister and his family, his relations to his community; the use of community resources as a means of extending the church's ministry; the relation of the ministry of the clergy to the ministry of the laity; and the problems of communicating the Gospel to people today, in the light of today's circumstances and conditions.

Some of the objectives of this study will be the nature and needs of people, the correlation of human questions with the Gospel; the discovery of structures that help clergy organize and direct their ministry so that the purposes of the Christian ministry may be kept in focus; and the discovery of the relevance and power of the church's ministry to the problems and opportunities of individual, family, and community life.

Trustees of the Institute are Henry S. Booth, Chairman of the Cranbrook Foundation, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Dr. Jerald C. Brauer, Dean of the Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago, Chi-

cago, Illinois; The Reverend Robert L. DeWitt, Christ Church, Cranbrook; the Rt. Reverend Richard S. M. Emrich, Bishop of the Diocese of Michigan; the Reverend Rollin J. Fairbanks, Department of Pastoral Theology, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge Massachusetts; the Reverend David R. Hunter, Director, Department of Christian Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Greenwich, Connecticut; The Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Lichtenberger, Chairman of the Joint Commission on Theological Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church, St. Louis, Missouri; Professor Howard Y. McClusky, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Neil C. McMath, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Charles F. Moore, Jr., Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Fred W. Sanders, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Howard B. Steggall, Birmingham, Michigan; the Very Reverend Jesse McL. Trotter, Dean of the Theological Seminary in Virginia of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Alexandria, Virginia; and the Reverend Theodore O. Wedel, Warden of the College of Preachers, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C.

Progress has already been made. Three conferences have been held in which ministers from the Episcopal, Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, Christian, Evangelical United Brethren churches have attended. Already the hopes for the Institute have been partially realized. Not only do the sessions contribute to the advanced training of clergy in their work, but the discussions incidental to this purpose reveal that when ministers of different churches address themselves to the deeper purposes of the church, they realize that they have common tasks, and, in spite of their differences, common resources.

The conferences for the rest of the year have been scheduled. Besides the regular clergy conferences, there will be ones for teachers in seminaries, college chaplains, women college workers, and denominational directors of Christian Education.

Inquiries will be welcomed from clergy and religious workers who might be interested in attending a session at the Institute.

The Journal of
Pastoral Care

VOL. XI WINTER, 1957 No. 4

EDITORIALS

The Clergyman and Research

In the review in this issue of Eaton and Weil's *Culture and Mental Disorders,* this writer has commented on the excellency of the work and also the need to have religion represented professionally on a research team that is probing so deeply into problems in which religion plays such a dominant part. It is the purpose of this editorial to elaborate on this suggestion.

Our concept of the kind of a person needed on such a team involves certain definite qualifications. He should, of course, have sound theological training, and should have training on the doctoral level in the psychology and sociology of religion. Part of this training should consist of a year of clinical pastoral training, since such a worker should be able to relate himself to the subjects of the research primarily as a pastor. Only in this way can the desired depth of understanding be achieved. He should also be a person with some pastoral experience. His contribution to such a research should be at the point of understanding the historical-theological dimensions of the problem involved but, more important, at the point of understanding the nature of the religious dimension of the present situation. Excellent as is the study of Eaton and Weil, it lacks this specifically religious perspective.

Where would such a person be found? There are some available, but they are few. There is a need for preparing more men with these skills. The question is whether they will be trained in the theological schools or in the departments of psychology and sociology in our universities. If within the seminary, these schools will have to enlarge their concept of research and develop a competent staff. By this, it is meant that the

linguistic-historical-literature type of research familiar to seminar faculties will need to be supplemented by training in methods which are suitable for the kind of personality-culture relationships which are illustrated in the Eaton and Weil study. The seminaries will do the cause of religion a disservice if they continue to force students who desire this kind of training to seek it elsewhere.

Here, also, is a question to which the clinical pastoral training movement must give serious thought. The men who have entered clinical training as supervisors have had their basic theological degree and have a deep interest in developing into effective pastors and in teaching in the clinical pastoral field. They were not trained in research in human development and relationships by their seminary, and, while they look upon research as highly desirable, their pastoral and educational duties have kept them from actively participating in it as much as they would like. One of the founders of the clinical pastoral training movement, the Rev. Anton T. Boisen, has criticized broad sections of the movement as not being interested in one of his dominant aims—namely, research; but Dr. Boisen has had to admit that his training in research was obtained in a school of forestry rather than in a school of theology!

The clinical pastoral training movement today understands that it can engage in research without sacrificing the aims of the pastor. Indeed, leaders in this movement are keenly aware of the need for research in this very field of the pastoral ministry, but only those will do research who are trained in it. The question is whether such training should be part of clinical pastoral training, or whether it is the responsibility of the seminary. Whatever the answer, it should be clear that a long period of clinical pastoral training should be in the background of any who attempt to do research from the religious point of view on problems similar to those represented by Eaton and Weil. In the opinion of this writer, the major responsibility for training in research of this kind lies at the door of the seminary, but here is another point at which the seminary and the clinical pastoral training movement may join in a cooperative endeavor of high significance for the future of the church.

C. A. W.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ministers and Social Workers: A Communication*

Our purpose was to develop better understandings between our two disciplines and to learn better ways of using each others' services. We met, on an average, once a month beginning in February of 1955, had a summer recess, and held our last meeting in January of 1956. Our group was made up of ministers of different denominations and faiths and caseworkers representing various kinds of casework agencies who counsel with families and individuals. Three of the ministers also had masters' degrees in social work. A church layman was our sixteenth member; he acted as a "catalyst" in opening up new areas of discussion.

We used informal discussions as our chief means of developing ideas together. We also made use of a subcommittee to try to determine our progress. At one point it was found helpful for the members of the two disciplines to have one meeting in separate groups. Toward the end of the study period each member was asked to write his impressions. Mr. Ormsby and the Rev. Mr. Reid shared with the group papers which they had written, one on counseling in a casework setting and one on pastoral counseling.

We found ourselves in agreement on many points, a little to our surprise and greatly to our delight. On other points we were not so much in disagreement as in perplexity. We were not discouraged by the questions we had to leave unanswered, for we felt there was real gain in their being pinpointed. Our discussions brought out that, historically, social work is based on the Judeo-Christian beliefs and traditions. We verbalized that both the minister and the caseworker are helping persons. We both are interested in the total person, although we emphasize different aspects. The clergyman knows persons through their whole life-span: in their "every-dayness," in their joys as well as in their perplexities. The caseworker sees them when their social adjustment problems confuse them or overwhelm them. The church is related to the whole life-relationship of a person, while the caseworker has relationship only around the temporal, short-term problems. Or, to put it another way, the caseworker helps persons with their disoriented relationships here in this dimension, while the minister also works to enrich persons' relationships with all other persons, and with God, in a different dimension. Another difference in emphasis which we identified was that the church's central purpose is not that of counseling, while counseling is a main function of casework.

The following factors in a counseling relationship were enunciated by the caseworkers and agreed with by the clergy. A basic part of any helping profession is the ability to assist a person to want help and to see and define his own problems. The attitude of the helping person must be supporting and enabling, based on a respect for the individual. "Disciplined awareness"

* Report of the Study Group of Ministers and Social Workers to the Board Committee of the Family Counseling Service, Philadelphia Protestant Episcopal City Mission, October 1956.

is needed in order to be of the most consistent helpfulness. A knowledge of the dynamics of human behavior is necessary. One important skill is to know how to avoid too intensive a relationship. It was also brought out that there is a difference between politeness or seeming kindness and love—love sometimes says things, to be of real help, which the person does not want to hear and which may even hurt. It was agreed that some improvements in relationships come about by the Grace of God, not only from an interplay between personalities.

We attempted to clarify the functions and to define the roles of ministers and caseworkers. We decided that a large proportion of social adjustment problems can and are treated by both disciplines. (The caseworkers came to realize the large amount of counseling a minister does, even though it is not his central function.) In general, the troubled person himself decides who should do the counseling when he chooses to go to either the minister or the caseworker. But we felt that some problems are best treated by one or the other of the disciplines. We visualized the situation as two circles widely overlapping each other. The large central part represents the problems properly handled by both disciplines. The smaller crescent "moons" on either side of the overlapping area stand for the kinds of problems one or the other of the disciplines is better fitted to treat.

We identified some of the special areas for the clergyman as premarital counseling, child spacing, divorce, etc., to give the church's teaching; confession; help to persons near death; help to persons in grief; guidance to persons needing help with their relationships with their God; and the like. We felt it was best for the caseworker to be drawn in when a wide knowledge of community resources is needed; when the problem involves medical, economic, social, or psychiatric factors; when diagnosis of the real problem and determination of the treatment are complicated; when treatment will necessitate a large number of counseling interviews, etc. The suggestion was also made that in a religiously divided family a casework agency might be of more help in marital counseling.

We found it was well to learn of some of the background differences between caseworkers and ministers as counselors. One difference is in the working milieu. A caseworker operates in an agency setting, not as an individual but within the framework of the agency's policies and functions. Caseworkers, on the whole, are persons trained in counseling. The clergy, by and large, have not had special training in this field. We felt that this was one of the factors which promotes a feeling of difference between many members of the two disciplines. We found in our discussions that the caseworkers are more definitive in what their work entails, and that they have a well-defined methodology. The clergy of our group felt that ministers on the whole have not yet clarified the particular area of their counseling or their method. They felt an immediate need for a theology of counseling.

We also tried to spot areas of irritation and resistance between our disciplines. It was thought that some ministers hesitate to refer a parishioner to a casework agency because it used to be "known" that caseworkers were Godless people and were cold and heartless. We felt that correction of this misconception has proceeded too slowly. Sometimes ministers feel that there

is too much agency red tape entangling them. They are often distressed when they may not pick a specific caseworker to whom they may refer their parishioners. Ministers do not usually keep case records, while caseworkers do. This seems to create a sense of difference which is disturbing to many ministers. Not infrequently they are also disquieted because the caseworker does not tell them everything which transpired in the casework interview. (We agreed wholeheartedly that both practitioners should work cooperatively with each other, keeping in close touch, when both are treating the same individual.)

Ministers sometimes regard caseworkers as rival counselors. However, every person who becomes better adjusted socially is a stronger member or potential member of the church. Caseworkers have a body of knowledge and skills that represent a disciplined way of working, which is helpful, but which is often misunderstood. Caseworkers sometimes are hesitant to refer a client to a minister because they have no way of knowing if a specific minister is competent in counseling. Caseworkers need to be more sensitive to indications of their clients' need of spiritual counseling. It is seldom that the client brings up the subject himself. There must be many hidden indices which show that underlying his overt problems is the need for a better relationship with his God. The caseworkers wanted to learn of these hidden signs, but the ministers found it hard to verbalize them.

We realized that we did not have the time to do more than isolate some other areas which we felt could fruitfully be considered at some time in the future:

1. A more specific definition of spiritual counseling. We recognized that pastoral counseling is concerned with many and differing kinds of problems, many of which are also handled in casework counseling. But spiritual counseling is particularly the function of the minister. The caseworkers expressed the need to understand better the delineations of it for the referral of clients.

2. A spelling-out of what are the hidden indices which point to a need for spiritual counseling.

3. A theology of pastoral counseling.

4. Casework has as a stated purpose the helping of people to become adjusted. The question was asked: adjusted to what?

5. Granted a caseworker can function effectively without religious conviction of his own, can he function as effectively in all cases as he could if he were a person of religious conviction?

6. Knowledge, understanding, and the use of the services of the other discipline should be taught in seminaries and graduate schools of social work. How best can this be done? How can these institutions be interested in developing such courses?

We found that there were not the great divergencies between caseworkers and ministers that are commonly supposed to exist. We enjoyed the frank and friendly give and take of our discussions. We felt that we gained considerable understanding of each other's work. We hope that at least some

of it has been crystalized enough to be of service to our compeers. We advocate more referrals between ministers and caseworkers to gain more knowledge and understanding of each others' fields; and we recommend that the unanswered questions we identified be explored by other committees of the Family Counseling Service some time not too removed from the present.

The Rev. Arnold Purdie, Chairman; *Executive Director, Episcopal City Mission*

Miss Milo Upjohn, Secretary, *Director, Family Counseling Service, Episcopal City Mission*

The Rev. Jerry Carpenter, *Director, Institutional Chaplaincy Service, Episcopal City Mission*

Mrs. Kenneth L. Cober, *committee member of the Council of Churches*[1]

Henry Dolan, Esq., *layman*

Miss Virginia Howlett, *Consultant, Family Division, Health and Welfare Council*

Miss Catherine Kerner, *Executive Director, Travelers Aid Society*

The Rev. Allan Langner, *Rabbi, Temple Israel*

The Rev. James J. Marley, *Director, Catholic Charities*[2]

Ralph Ormsby, *Executive Director, Family Service of Philadelphia*

The Rev. Emmett P. Paige, *Rector, St. Mark's Church*

Miss Mary L. Poole, *Director, Social Service Department, University of Pennsylvania Hospital*

The Rev. James Burnett Reid, *Pastor, First Presbyterian Church*

The Rev. F. Lee Richards, *Rector, St. Andrew's-in-the-Field*

The Rev. Joseph L. Schantz, *Pastor, St. James Lutheran Church*

Benjamin Sprafkin, *Executive Director, Jewish Family Service*

The Rev. Spencer L. Stockwell, *Executive Secretary, Community Services Department, Council of Churches*

Brigadier Bertha Williams, *Social Welfare Secretary, Family Service Department, Salvation Army*

---

[1] Mrs. Cober accepted membership but was unable to attend meetings and therefore resigned.

[2] Fr. Marley was invited but was unable to accept membership on the Study Group.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Edited by The Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks

Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis: William Graham Cole; Oxford University Press, New York, 1955. 329 pp. $4.00.

William Graham Cole's book is divided into three main sections: Part One, "Interpretations of Sex in Christianity"; Part Two, "Interpretations of Sex in Psychoanalysis"; and Part Three, "A Critical Reconstruction of Christian Interpretations of Sex."

To start with Part Two, the chapters on Freud and on contemporary psychoanalysis in which Karen Horney, Franz Alexander, and Sandor Rado are presented and interpreted are brilliantly written and offer one of the best interpretations of psychoanalytical thinking to the non-psychiatric professional. The clergyman will be able to form a clear concept of modern psychodynamic psychiatry, and we psychiatrists may be thankful to find in William Cole such an articulate disciple who presents this difficult material so skillfully to a critical and often skeptical ministry.

Part One, "Interpretations of Sex in Christianity," encompasses 195 pages and is almost a book in itself. Cole deals with the following subjects; I. Jesus and Paul; II. Augustine; III. Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent; IV. Luther and Calvin; V. Contemporary Catholicism; and VI. Contemporary Protestantism. The presentation is fascinating, courageous, provocative, and often witty. It is rare to find a book by a devout Christian and theologian who so candidly approaches problems that have been the subject of argument throughout the history of Christianity. What Cole says, for instance, about the attitude of the various religious groups toward divorce and war is very striking. He is undoubtedly right in pointing out that the historical attitude toward divorce is based on rather meager evidence open to many interpretations, while the New Testament is quite definite with regard to war, and yet Christian bodies (with notable exceptions) have rarely hesitated to support national wars and suffer the terrible bloodshed that has characterized Christian civilization from its very beginning.

As to the interpretation of sex in the Bible and in Christianity, Cole attempts to provide evidence that the new interpretation of sex in psychoanalysis is not in conflict with Christianity. His expositions appear stimulating and healthy if directed against a Mid-Victorian bigotry. However, such an attitude has long since gone by the board and his crusade in favor of sex seems slightly outdated. Christianity has always been concerned with the difference between love and sexuality, or the new man and the "Old Adam," and no thinking person can deny that the transformation of sexuality into love and the overcoming of selfishness (concupiscence) in a loving relatedness has by no means been solved by modern psychiatry.

It is somewhat disappointing to see that a theologian makes his readers

so little aware of the problems of spirituality and sexuality. Many of Cole's interpretations appear somewhat arbitrary. It may be true that some of the Bible stories originally carried a different meaning than the one conveyed down through the ages. It may be true that the story of the original sin of Adam and Eve did not refer merely to sexuality but as much to transgression of the law as to sexuality itself. But the very fact that Adam hid himself from the face of God and covered his sexuality because he was ashamed leaves no doubt that, even in the minds of the early historians, some dualism in the conscious mind of man is a very basic experience.

It has also become the latest fashion to trace "dualism" to the Hellenistic influence on Christianity, while the Hebrew tradition is said to be inspired by a healthy enjoyment of procreation. The opposite was certainly true at the time of the Renaissance when medieval Christianity was liberated and enabled to enjoy the beauty of the human body through the influence of the newly discovered Greek world.

The claim that Paul's interpretation of Christianity was strictly a Hebrew tradition, only expressed in Greek language, must also be considered rather one-sided since there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary which is completely disregarded by Cole.

Part Three, which deals with reconstruction, seems to this reviewer to come somewhat as an anticlimax. Again where Cole acts as psychiatrist and interprets psychiatric thinking to the ministry, he seems lucid and successful in trying to reduce the moralistic attitude of the Christian Church toward sex and sexual deviations which Cole assumes without question to be the prevalent attitude. When the psychiatric reader expects Cole to furnish some new theological aspects to the secular scientific knowledge of the present day, one cannot help feeling that he does not talk of Christianity but of *church attitudes*. When he writes (page 285): "The Church has been guilty of preserving and preaching a point of view not generic to Christian faith, an attitude which originated in Hellenistic dualism and which is not only un-Biblical but also anti-Biblical," one must seriously doubt whether Cole's obsession with regard to Hellenistic dualism versus healthy Semitic monism is very sound. A few pages later (page 293) Cole states: "The first classic Christian doctrine with significant implications for an interpretation of sex is the belief in creation. Reference has already been made to William Temple's assertion that Christianity is the most materialistic of the great religions of the world." To call Christianity the most materialistic of the great religions, even if he is able to quote William Temple as support, does not make this statement any more meaningful, especially in a time when the Christian world is faced with the dialectic materialism of the Communistic world in which Christianity certainly needs a sounder understanding of spirituality.

It may be noticed that Cole has no concept of the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Christianity has always been concerned with the life after death, and the questions that arise out of the problem of seeing this life *subspecie aeternitatis*. The attitudes, joys, and sufferings of this world are judged under the aspect of how much they contribute to man's justification in the eyes of God. If this world is *seen* in a

different light, the set of values becomes different; and it is this conflict between eternity and life in this world that creates most of the friction between psychiatry and religion in interpreting life. While the book is full of stimulating and interesting thoughts, the "reconstruction" sometimes seems too simple and not up to the standards of the previous chapters.

CLEMENS E. BENDA, M.D.

An Introduction to a Christian Psychotherapy: J. A. C. Murray; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, revised 1947. 279 pp. $3.75.

This volume first appeared in 1938. The second edition contains no new material. It is an attempt on the part of the author to point up the necessary synthesis between the insights of the Christian religion and modern depth psychology. That he does so from a strongly "analytical Psychology" (Jungian) point of view, with not infrequent scathing broadsides at the "Freudians," is quite apparent, but does not invalidate the cogency of his arguments. Neither does it cover up his indebtedness to some of Freud's basic understandings.

Though there is much in this volume to stimulate thinking about psychotherapy and religion, it is felt that the work will be of primary interest to scholars in this field. This is just as well because of its outmoded nosology, the continental usage of terminology ("psycopath" for "psychopathy," etc.) and its "primitive" notions of therapy ("get at" the unconscious mind). But, on the other hand, there is much in these pages that will reward the diligent and careful reader.

Perhaps the most signal contribution is the author's delineation of the crisis situations of human experience: birth, maturation, mating, choice of vocation, later years, illness, death, etc., as the most significant opportunities for the pastoral counselor. There is a wealth of scriptural and doctrinal references which provoke further exploration. Not the least of these is the reference to Tyndale's equation of "salvation" with "health." This reviewer is led to speculate whether this might not then throw light on that cryptic and bothersome phrase in the General Confession found in the Offices of Morning and Evening Prayer as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer: "There is no health in us"!

This is by no means a definitive book and should certainly be read with caution. But, having so read it, one can be most grateful for the many and challenging vistas exposed for future investigation. It offers numerous clues for original investigation in what will prove to be a most fruitful field of inquiry: the relationship of what is learned from clinical experience to both Christian faith and practice. To this our generation must address itself if it would bring to fruition the great labors of those, like this author, who have dared enter into the realm of the everyday turmoil of living.

ERNEST E. BRUDER

Where to Go for Help: Wayne E. Oates; Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1957. 118 pp. $2.00.

This is the latest in the Westminster Pastoral Aid series. It is intended as a "handbook of ready reference" both for those in need of counseling help and for those who seek to help them. The volume is the outcome of many calls the author has received for the kind of understanding and information he now makes available in its pages. The book addresses itself to two main concerns: first, the nature, relationship, literature, and principles of the major "helping professions"; and, second, the specific problems which have most frequently come to the author's attention. Some thirteen are outlined in this latter category.

Many a troubled person and busy pastor will be grateful for this small volume. It does make readily available much that is helpful in dealing with our daily difficulties in living, and in a manner which clearly indicates that such problems do not get solved merely by reading or listening to some "expert." The author recommends clinical training as advisable for the pastoral counselor. This reviewer regrets that it was not made clearer that considerable clinical training is mandatory preparation for any kind of counseling. No preparation for personal counseling can be termed adequate today which does not demand clinical experience under competent supervision.

ERNEST E. BRUDER

•

Culture and Mental Disorders: Joseph W. Eaton and Robert J. Weil; The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955. 254 pp. $4.00.

The problem of the relation of culture as a causative factor in mental illness involves many unanswered questions, and is even more complicated when religion is a dominant factor in the culture. This book contains the results of a research in this area. Headed by a sociologist (Dr. Eaton), with the collaboration of a psychiatrist (Dr. Weil), a research team made an intensive study of the Hutterites, a religious sect that emigrated from Russia and settled in the Dakotas and western Canada between 1874-77. Since then this group has lived in its own communal villages, maintaining their old-world traditions and religious practices and strenuously resisting the forces which would make for integration into the American culture. In many respects, they are as "pure" a cultural group as will be found in this country. This research set out to study the incidence of mental illness among these people, and the relation of mental illness to their way of life.

The book contains too much of a factual nature to make any brief summary possible. Among these facts are the low incidence of schizophrenia; the higher incidence of depressive disorders; the group's acceptance of the mentally ill completely without stigma and with a realistic inclusion of them in their communal life; their rigid and strict moralistic training of children and strong demand for conformity from all members; their provision for social and religious repentance, restitution and acceptance of all repentant deviates within the fellowship; and the strong cohesive force of their religious faith. While the simplified, communal life did not prevent mental disorders, it did provide a therapeutic community "in the sense that the traumatic

social consequences of being mentally ill were kept at a minimum." Religion "can be both a positive and negative mental health element."

The book is deserving of careful study by all interested in the culture-personality problem or in the relation of religion to personality health and illness. There is real insight here into the psychology of certain kinds of religious experience. It should be very useful in clinical pastoral training, both for supervisors and for the students. It deserves study in our theological schools, as it portrays much in regard to the group processes in religion. Its great weakness is that there was no clinically trained pastor-theologian in the research group. A chapter by such a person would have greatly strengthened the study and made it much more useful to students of the religious factors in mental health and illness. It is time social scientists begin to include ministers with adequate clinical pastoral training in such research groups.

CARROLL A. WISE

•

This Is Your Neighbor: Louise Rossiter Shotwell; Friendship Press, New York, 1956. 24 pp. 50 cents.

This is a graphic and comprehensive survey of the Church's job in "Mission Field, U.S.A.," and it is done miraculously by means of a few pages of script and splendid photographs. Only a person expert in her field could have performed such a job with such telling effect, for, like an artist who can present a convincing story with a deft stroke or two, Miss Shotwell has presented the problems that must confront all of our churches in a rapidly changing urban scene. Her story is not merely theory or wishful thinking, but is an account of actual accomplishment in this field so overwhelming in extent. Her approach is soundly based on a seeking for the real Christian meaning of neighbors and she escaped any sentimental notions about "God's Poor." It is so stimulating an introduction to the subject that one only regrets that a bibliography and suggested topics for discussion have not been added to satisfy the interest that undoubtedly will be aroused.

JOHN MELVILLE BURGESS

•

An Historian's Approach to Religion: Arnold Toynbee; Oxford University Press, New York, 1956. 318 pp. $5.00.

In his Gifford Lectures, delivered at Edinburgh in 1952 and 1953, Arnold Toynbee undertook to discuss "the glimpse we get of the Universe when we look at it from an historian's point of view." This book, based on the lectures, preserves Toynbee's "glimpse" for our inspection and edification. The professional historian, we are told, achieves his point of view by a "conscious and deliberate" effort "to shift his angle of vision away from the initial self-centered standpoint that is natural to him as a living creature." Hence, as Toynbee unaccountably fails to notice, the historian's point of view is no different from that aimed at by every disinterested scholar: the point of view of objective, scientific detachment. What makes Toynbee's approach to religion specifically "an historian's approach" is not his point of view, but the subject matter on which he focuses his attention. Toynbee's glimpse of the

Universe is an historian's glimpse, not self-centered, perhaps, but surely "history-centered," and some philosophers and astronomers might rebuke Mr. Toynbee for foisting upon us, without apology, a doctrine of the Chosen Planet in place of the doctrine of the Chosen People, which he deprecates.

Having adopted the religious hypothesis that human history is the locus of the central purpose of the Universe, Toynbee proceeds to interpret that history in religious categories. The natural and necessary state of man is one of self-centeredness, but this is also a state of sin: "Self-centeredness is an intellectual error, because no living creature is in truth the center of the Universe, and it is also a moral error, because no living creature has a right to act as if it were the center of the Universe." For salvation from self-centeredness Toynbee directs us to higher religions—Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and the two major varieties of Buddhism. But which higher religion shall we choose? Toynbee gives two answers. Tentatively accepting C. G. Jung's theory of psychological types, he suggests that "each of the surviving faiths (has) an affinity with one particular psychological type," so that in the next chapter of man's spiritual history we may expect to see all the higher religions still surviving side by side, but an individual's religion will be determined, "not by the locality of his birthplace, but by a deliberate choice of the faith" for which his psychological type best fits him. On this view Sir William Gilbert's "boys and gals" are born, not little Liberals and Conservatives, but little Muslims and Mahayana Buddhists. Alternately, Toynbee urges that we must choose the higher religion which is closest to the essence of true Religion, or, if none qualifies, to build a new religion which does. This suggestion is hardly novel.

Admirers of the *Study of History* will find much to admire in this book. Indeed, seven of the first ten chapters are avowedly drawn from material contained in that earlier work. Here again is Toynbee's polished, magisterial prose, here again are the ultra-scholarly elegancies which mar it. Toynbee seems to make it a rule to provide every page with at least one word transliterated from Sanskrit, Arabic, or Greek, invariably embellished with diacritical marks.

There is much to praise in this book, less to deplore. Toynbee's analyses are not always correct, his conclusions not always justified: but even his blunders are in a great tradition. When he lumps together superficially similar features of religions without adequately attending to differences in detail, he is embracing what might be called the fallacy of *The Golden Bough.* Sometimes his simplifications and generalizations result in the obscuring of crucial differences: he finds that, according to the higher religions, "man's goal is to seek communion with the presence behind the phenomena, and to seek it with the aim of bringing his self into harmony with this absolute spiritual reality." He recognizes that some of the higher religions emphasize the "personal," others the "impersonal" aspects of this Presence, but he does not tell us that, according to some religions, the Presence actively seeks communion with men. Is this a "non-essential" characteristic?

There are at least two things in the book which are of great value. First there is the author's moving plea for tolerance and charity, contained in the closing chapters. The other is his fine discussion of the dangers which beset the higher religions when they encounter various secular institutions. In this

discussion he speaks of religion as the seed which was sown by the Sower, some of which fell among thorns, some on rocky ground, and some of which were eaten by birds. When he comes to discuss the treatment accorded religion by secular philosophies, he is obliged to invent a new verse:

> And some seeds fell upon a conveyor belt and were carried into a factory, where they were processed, refrigerated, and sterilized.

The seeds which fell upon good ground are not mentioned; did they really yield a hundredfold, or do we still await their germination?

EUGENE V. N. GOETCHIUS

•

The Bent World: J. V. Langmead Casserley; Oxford University Press, New York, 1955. 286 pp. $4.00.

Like Erich Fromm's *The Sane Society,* Dr. Casserley's *The Bent World* is a plea for a better world. Although an ordained priest in the Church of England, he preferred teaching to preaching and is, currently, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the General Theological Seminary in New York City. He pulls no punches in his newest book and spells out the overemphasis on secular materialism at the expense of human and spiritual values in the Western world with its obsessive worship of high finance, technology, and its misuse of man as slave rather than master of the machine. It is this secularity, Dr. Casserley believes, that weakens the West. In fact, our overemphasis on the economy and materialism at the expense of the spiritual side of life "resembles Marxism" (into which he penetrates with careful detail in Part One, "Marxism in Theory and Practice"). His answer to this weakness in our way of life is a reaffirmation and more serious utilization of Christian concepts in a seven-day-a-week form of Christianity.

In Part Two, under the title, "The West in Practice and Theory," Dr. Casserley discusses the "deification of democracy" and the obsession with techniques, economic doctrines, and economic activity. Some people wish to turn democracy "into a moral ideal, almost an absolute religion." Democracy is only a "method of group behavior," whereas Christianity is "a total way of life." Democracy at its best should be a "Christian society that practices and employs the techniques of democracy with sincerity and integrity." Just as a democracy can employ Christian principles to achieve a high plane of ethical and moral function, so can a church use democratic principles in its self-government and the administration of its affairs.

Man is so delighed with his technological advances that he identifies with them, neglecting his spiritual nature. Man must not forget that technology is "concerned with means, not ends"; is the servant, not the god, of man. We worship the cult of the workingman, but "democracy cannot be said to have achieved its aim so long as a proletariat still survives." The proletariat must be "eliminated" by encouraging the workingman to achieve deeper values and satisfactions, "inheriting the whole richness of Western civilization, pouring into the churches and the symphony concerts, consciously aware of the excellence of its rationalism and its mysticism, comprehending its poets, and acquainted with its philosophers," for a man not culturally oriented is a "slave of a civilization to which he does not belong."

Dr. Casserley asks for a greater spiritual unity among the Western nations and believes that nationalism and the excessive worship of one's own country, alone, tends to follow an alienation from spiritual influence and faith.

Many authors have pointed out the positive side of divorce as a means of adjustment to an incompatible marriage where one or both partners refuse the aid of a psychotherapist, marital or pastoral counselor, and where the children need to be saved from growing up in an environment of nagging and fighting. But Dr. Casserley awakens us to a factor on the negative side of the divorce problem. Divorce in some states has become easier to obtain—with less expense and in a shorter time. Knowing that the marital partner may get a divorce if the spouse does not fulfill his every expectation, even relatively compatible couples may dwell under a curtain of fear and insecurity waiting for the dreaded ax to fall through one false step. But this reviewer (after counseling many couples in the past dozen years) cannot go along with Dr. Casserley's argument against divorce when children are involved. His argument (p. 209) is that the "norm of marriage is not the husband-wife relationship but the father-mother-child relationship." If, however, the parents are unhappy together, it is this reviewer's judgment that they cannot possibly play the mother-father roles effectively and lovingly, so that divorce and remarriage might be better for the children as well as for the original parents. Most people, as children, if forced to a choice, would prefer a loving stepmother or step-father to a bickering, frustrated, and hateful parent.

The American's obsession with romantic love contributes to the divorce problem by setting up romantic ideals that few husbands and wives can achieve, and it does not have to be mentioned that our literature and movie presentations have, in the past, tended to create and maintain such rosy fictions of an unreal view of the marital relationship. Couples may feel guilty or deprived if they do not achieve the American ideal of romantic love, but "genuine romantic love is much more than mere stupefying and intoxicating sex haze. It is a profound personal relationship which . . . includes passion and desire, but which, nevertheless, transcends them. True romantic love *is* real love . . . a blessed release from our self-centeredness."

Again Dr. Casserley is unrealistic when (p. 219) he insists that some people should "refrain altogether from sexual behavior" because they are so instinctual in their sexual relationships ("do it like animals"). It is these very people who might find it most difficult to remain celibate. He also believes that the homosexual problem could be better solved by celibacy "than in a marrying society . . . which interprets 'single blessedness' as an unparalleled misfortune." This reads well in print, but it's as easy to carry out as the mouse belling the cat.

On the question of extra-marital intercourse, Dr. Casserley has the courage to say that "some sexual relationships outside marriage may be, and often are, profoundly personal and enduring ones. There is a great deal of difference between a lasting liaison based on deep love and comradeship and loyalty, and a merely promiscuous wandering from bed to bed." In fact, the implication in this chapter is clear that Dr. Casserley would rather have couples live together who are unsuited for the permanent bonds of matrimony than feel forced by society and the Church to enter a marriage doomed to failure. (One might add that in America there is a greater tendency to marry in order

to *justify* a relationship, and then it is too late to rectify the error except through annulment, separation, or divorce; whereas in Europe there is a greater caution concerning entering into a *permanent* union until the couple really know each other well enough in a relationship that would be considered promiscuous in America.)

Dr. Casserley (like William Graham Cole in *Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis*) emphasizes the fact that the Bible as a whole is "free from any morbid and unclean horror of sexuality." Sexuality is "part of the God-given natural endowment of man and cannot conceivably be regarded as unclean *per se*." But, opposed to divorce, Dr. Casserley seems to prefer adultery. Christianity, he believes, has the "desire at all costs to preserve the fullness and richness of holy matrimony . . . even at the cost of mundane respectability itself," for the "prudishness of modern middle-class society (has) no ultimate theological sanction" (p. 230).

In his closing chapter, Dr. Casserley sees us as a bent and strained, but not a "broken," world, whose source of vitality is Christianity which will make it straight.

HAROLD KENNETH FINK

•

Anxiety and Magic Thinking: Charles Odier, M.D.; International Universities Press, New York, 1956. 302 pp. $5.00.

Once when speaking of a child's enjoyment of the Post Office, G. K. Chesterton observed that the Kingdom of God is to be able to enjoy a thing without understanding it fully. The wise men of psychiatry and biblical theology may *yet* meet at the feet of little children in whom theology and life are still inseparable. The child is a realist in whom words and actions are closely related. He defines things in terms of what they do. Thus *A Hole Is to Dig* (an exceptional book of first definitions by Ruth Krauss) and "hands are to hold." His language belongs to the realm of *verb theology*. He is at home with the "recital theology" of the Bible—with the *God Who Acts*.

Jean Piaget and his co-workers through years of observation and study have illuminated the language and thought of the child. In general, it is characterized by a prelogical realism in which words are bound up in actions. Now Charles Odier, himself a psychoanalyst, in his book, *Anxiety and Magic Thinking*, attempts to relate the findings of Piaget to the adult use of magic in neurosis. Odier finds a clue to this relationship in the phenomena of regression to the infantile mental attitude of "adualism" (a confusion between the self and the "not-self") and "infantile realism" in which there is a confusion between the sign and the thing signified. This way of thinking makes it possible for the adult to attribute his own psychic qualities to objects and people outside himself and to order his life in compliance with this absolute "externalization" of reality. For the child such an attitude is reasonable. In the adult it represents the abdication involved in radical moral heteronomy. Hence one of Dr. Odier's patients who had dreamed that her husband was cruel to her concluded her account of the dream by saying angrily, "It was awful . . . You see how this husband of mine is. He is simply criminal. His only desire is to see me dead . . . "

The connecting link between infantile attitudes and the development of, or lack of, an adult sense of security, valorization and autonomy, is the emotional *affect* which surrounds and clings to crucial experiences in the child's development. Odier claims that this concern of genetic psychology in the formation of self-awarness is a necessary adjunct to the psychoanalytic emphasis on unconscious motivation. In the neurotic that ego strength is a fragile thing ready to capitulate before the first threat. Indeed every danger recalls the helplessness of the individual as he has experienced *abandonment*, actual or imagined, in the past. In this panic the *abandonee* turns to magic devices and runs away, like a desolate child, from those who have disappointed him.

The theme of this book is of signal importance. We must leave it to the specialists to evaluate the accuracy of Odier's conclusions. However, one who is concerned with the communication of the Gospel cannot leave the matter where the infinite wisdom of children and poets is too simply identified as neurosis when found in adults. Where it involves a naive rejection of reality and moral abdication, one may correctly call it pathology—or even sin! But this reviewer suspects that the ages will stand with Shelley as both adult and childlike when he insists:

> Hail to thee, blithe spirit!
> Bird thou never wert . . .

As Chesterton has said, the poet refuses to believe that a bird is simply a bird. Nor do words—particularly the words of the Bible and of sacred moment—convey merely abstract meaning. Perhaps some student of Odier (the author is deceased) will provide us with a treatment of the healthy "affect" which results when one lives unhesitatingly with the reality of his own life in the conviction that for us men and for our salvation the word was made flesh and dwelt among us!

CHARLES R. STINNETTE, JR.

•

Psychiatry and Religion: International Symposia: Edited by Felix Marti-Ibanez; MD Publications, New York, 1955. 62 pp. $3.00.

"Psychiatry and Religion" is the title of a special issue of the *International Record of Medicine and General Practice Clinics*, devoted to a Symposium on this subject. The volume contains the contributions of thirteen authors who discuss a wealth of subjects. Unfortunately each author could devote only a few pages to his subject.

While this particular volume is interesting and stimulating, and deserves to be known by people interested in this field, nevertheless, it must also be said that none of the authors contributes any creative ideas to the problem of psychiatry and religion. Most of the contributors are experts in their own field but when they discuss religion, they actually speak as private persons who express opinions which are more or less interesting but which have little authority behind them. The results contribute little to an understanding of the way in which religion does or does not influence psychiatric thinking and practice, and in which way religion may or may not have influence on the shaping of the unconscious mind. It is significant that the majority of these

authors base their thinking about this field on Jung rather than Freud. Those who are Freudians feel the need to explain that, in spite of Freud's definite attitude toward religion, they themselves recognize religion as a positive factor and dare therefore to deviate from the recognized orthodoxy of the school or to attempt a new interpretation of Freud's ideas—an interpretation which certainly was not meant by Freud himself.

One may congratulate the editor for the stimulating idea of bringing this Symposium together in a publication. He himself contributes an editorial introduction which reveals his wide literary knowledge and warm feelings, without commitment to any creed or conviction which could interfere with the spirit of universal tolerance.

CLEMENS E. BENDA, M.D.

•

Royce on the Human Self: James Harry Cotton; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1954. 347 pp. $5.00.

It is puzzling that Josiah Royce has not received the attention which has been accorded his well-known contemporaries who respected him so highly, James and Peirce. Perhaps the absence of a systematic exposition of Royce's thought has been partly responsible. Mr. Cotton, former President of McCormick Theological Seminary and now Chairman of the Philosophy Department at Wabash College, has more than remedied this situation. With a scholarship that is graceful while convincing, the author defends his thesis that Royce's conception of the human self is the focal point of his entire system. For Royce, both epistemology and ethics must begin with the isolated individual's frustrating experience of the insufficiency of the present moment. Knowledge of the real world comes laboriously, through long processes of social verification. Action that is good can be performed only when the individual is part of a larger community whose purposes he has made his own. For Royce, the central problem of metaphysics is the relationship between the finite self and the Larger Self which realizes his partial purposes and fulfills the meaning of his limited ideas. And logic is more than a set of formal rules. It has metaphysical import in that it is applicable to the actual world. It has ethical import in that rationality and reasonable belief are morally demanded of us all.

If the isolated individual is a lost soul, wherein lies his salvation? Patiently and sympathetically Mr. Cotton lays bare Royce's struggles to answer this question. Early an Absolutist, Royce took seriously the criticism that he had eclipsed the freedom of the finite individual by the Higher Self. Gradually Royce became more of a voluntarist, more of a pragmatist, more of a pluralist. Human selfhood is not a birthright; it is something achieved when rational purposes give unity first to my fragmentary experiences, then to the social fabric of which I am a part. Knowledge is a form of activity. Ideas are plans of action. Judgments are acts of will. Belief, moreover, is as integral to science as it is to religion. Where science believes that the real world answers our demand for order, religion believes that it answers our demand for the fulfillment of our highest moral interests. Royce's Absolute becomes more and more a social Absolute, a community of men. This community is an empirical entity with a life of its own, and as such is literally a person. Con-

versely, inasmuch as an individual person is a unity of his past, present, and future self, he is also literally a community. In this way Royce develops his ordered pluralism.

The author sees in this doctrine a profound and prophetic protest against the dehumanization, the mechanization, the rootlessness, and the leveling of modern society. He shows how Royce took Paul's vision of the mystical body of the Church as a model for his saving community. Royce found the Pauline interpretation of Christianity to be "man's most impressive vision of salvation, and his principal glance of the homeland of the spirit." Mr. Cotton concludes that Royce's doctrine of loyalty and of the community expresses philosophically a religious insight and need at once timeless and basic to man.

If there is a fault to be found with this book, it is perhaps the somewhat pedestrian tone, the lackluster prose, the absence, except in quotations, of Royce's effusive, compelling, buoyant spirit, so often reminiscent of Emerson. But Mr. Cotton has, no doubt wisely, given us instead with clarity and cogency the logical development of Royce's thought. For this the reader has every reason to be grateful.

PETER L. FUSS

•

Sermons on Marriage and Family Life: Edited by John Charles Wynn; Abingdon Press, New York, 1956. 173 pp. $2.75.

Once a man is ordained, all too seldom does he have opportunities to listen to others' sermons. Save for a few Sundays when he's on holiday, part of any parson's offering is preaching the Word, not hearing it. A book like *Sermons on Marriage and Family Life* brings refreshment, new insights, varied approaches, and provides personal enjoyment as well as interesting material the clergyman-reader himself may wish to develop and elaborate from the pulpit. There are sixteen sermons which cover family worship, marriage, child training, family crises, and sex standards. "Fifth Commandment Christians" by The Rev. Hoover Rupert, "When The Bottom Drops Out" by The Rev. Jack Sanders, and "How to Face Family Tragedy" by The Rev. Margaret Blair Johnstone are outstanding. The latter two sermons live, even in print, and counsel specific techniques without becoming infected with easy religion. The book is recommended, especially to parish clergymen.

HENRY H. WIESBAUER

•

Fear Not: Henry I. Louttit; The Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn., 1954. 61 pp. $1.75.

This small book of five addresses has many interesting illustrations and anecdotes that are quite catching. However, the person who looks for any deep insight or understanding of the origin and roots of fear will be disappointed. The author gets caught in the old dilemma of denouncing fear in this book as destructive, and then having to add later on that it has its value too, as a reality protective device.

There is a certain type of exhortation that seems to be a natural part

of preaching, but one wonders what real value it has; for example, "We must stop carrying the failures of the past along with us," and "we must stop worrying about things we cannot help" (page 9). It is unfortunate that in his second address the author uses the King James version of I John 4:18, "Fear hath torment." Certainly the Revised Standard Version, "fear has to do with punishment," is much more suggestive of the real roots of fear.

In his last address, "As a man thinketh," Bishop Louttit raises the question, "How can we control fear, the great enemy to our peace and happiness?" His suggestions are rather inadequate: "With effort and perseverance we can control our thoughts . . . We do not have to think about our troubles, unless we wish to think about them" (page 55). Certainly this would be of little help to anyone caught in the web of his own fears, and it tends to ignore the depth and power of the instinctive and emotional forces in human personality.

While the book will be of some homiletical value to the clergy and perhaps of some inspirational value to the laity, nevertheless if the fears that plague human life in our present culture are to be in any way understood and dealt with, it will take a more profound understanding than presented in this volume.

ARTHUR G. ELCOMBE

OUR REVIEWERS

Clemens E. Benda is a psychiatrist in Boston, Massachusetts . . . *Ernest E. Bruder* is Coordinator of the Protestant Chaplain Services at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C. . . . *Carroll A. Wise* is Professor of Pastoral Psychology and Counseling at Barrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois . . . *John Melville Burgess* is Archdeacon of Boston, Diocese of Massachusetts . . . *Eugene V. N. Goetchius* is a resident of Athens, Greece . . . *Harold Kenneth Fink* is a group therapist at the American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry as well as a psychotherapist in private practice in New York City . . . *Charles R. Stinnette, Jr.,* is Associate Professor of Pastoral Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City . . . *Peter L. Fuss* is a tutor at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts . . . *Henry H. Wiesbauer* is Protestant Chaplain at Westboro State Hospital, Westboro, Massachusetts . . . *Arthur G. Elcombe* is Chaplain at Episcopal Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Dr. Seward Hiltner, Professor of Pastoral Theology at the University of Chicago, was an Alfred P. Sloan visiting professor at The Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas, for a three-month period beginning in September.

•

The National Convention of the Religious Education Association was held in Chicago, November 24-26. The theme of the Convention had to do with the secular and sacred images of man and the issues posed by these images for education and religion.

•

The ninth 12-week course on "The Pastoral Care of the Mentally Ill" for Washington clergymen began on September 30. Sponsored by the Council of Churches of the National Capital Area, Department of Christian Education, and taught at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, the course is designed to help the busy community clergyman develop a more effective pastoral ministry, both to his parishioner who is ill and to the members of the patient's family. The course is under the supervision of the Rev. Ernest E. Bruder, Coordinator of the Protestant Chaplain Services at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and the Reverends Robert B. Robey and Edward F. Dobihal, Jr., Protestant Chaplains. Lecturers are from the hospital staff.

•

The Rev. Homer L. Jernigan joined the faculty of Boston University School of Theology in the Department of Psychology and Pastoral Counseling in September. He was formerly Chaplain Supervisor at Western State Hospital in Staunton, Virginia.

•

An Institute on Pastoral Counseling, an interdenominational conference on the mental hygiene principles of personal counseling, was held on November 9 at State University of New York Teachers College, Oneonta, under the auspices of the Health Association of Otsego County, Inc., Committee on Mental Health. Luther E. Woodward, Ph.D., was the principal speaker.

•

The Rev. Anton T. Boisen visited Saint Elizabeths Hospital in Washington on August 8 to address the group of Protestant Seminary students in summer clinical training there.

•

The newest in The Upper Room Devotional Classics is from the writings of John Woolman, American Quaker. It is available at 15 cents per single copy, 10 copies for $1.00, 100 or more copies at 7 cents each from The Upper Room, 1908 Grand Avenue, Nashville 5, Tennessee. Other booklets in this series include *The Imitation of Christ, The Practice of the Presence, Luther's Table Talk, Selections from Augustine, Selections from John Bunyan, Selections from George Fox, Selections from John Wesley, Selections from Francis Asbury, Selections from Saint Francis,* Law's *A Serious Call to Devout and Holy Life, Selections from A Testament of Devotions,* and *Selections from Kierkegaard.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI

ARTICLES

APPLEBY, LAWRENCE. The Relationship between Rigidity and Religious Participation ... 73-83

BLAINE, GRAHAM B., JR. Religion and Psychiatry: Some Philosophical Observations ... 84-90

BRUDER, ERNEST E. Training and the Mental Hospital Chaplain ... 136-145

CEDARLEAF, J. LENNART. The Clinical Use of the Initial Religious Interview ... 156-161

CESARMAN, F. C. Religious Conversion of Sex Offenders during Psychotherapy: Two Cases ... 25-35

COHEN, FELIX. Theism and Maturity ... 1-5

DEITCHMAN, ROBERT B. The Evolution of a Ministerial Counseling Center ... 207-214

FARNSWORTH, DANA L. Denial as a Defense ... 36-37

FARNSWORTH, DANA L. Mental Health and the Individual ... 104-105

FINK, HAROLD KENNETH, and FINK, GEORGIA ELISABETH. When Trouble Runs Deep ... 91-97

GIANAKON, HARRY G. The Minister and the Psychiatrist as a Team ... 215-221

HOWE, REUEL L. The Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies—A New Development ... 226-228

KEIDEL, KEITH W. Religious Influences for Mental Health ... 20-24

KEIDEL, KEITH W. A Chaplain Looks at His Patients ... 98-100

LESLIE, ROBERT C. Group Experience and Communication in Interpersonal Relations ... 65-72

MICHALSON, CARL. Faith for the Crisis of Marriage ... 193-206

MURPHY, CAROL R. Two Paths of Spiritual Growth ... 129-135

ROGERS, KENNETH H. The Centenary of the Birth of Freud ... 6-13

SALZMAN, LEON. Observations on Dr. Tillich's Views on Guilt, Sin, and Reconciliation ... 14-19

SALZMAN, LEON. Spiritual and Faith Healing ... 146-155

SHEN, PHIL. Reflections on Clinical Training: A Meditation ... 101-103

STRUNK, ORLO, JR. Training of Empathic Abilities: A Note ... 222-225

Editorials

Fairbanks, Rollin J. The Appeal of Existentialism 111-112

Furgeson, Earl H. National Conference on Clinical Pastoral Education 38-40

Hiltner, Seward. Psychological Tests for Ministerial Candidates ... 106-108

Michalson, Carl. Coexistence 110-111

Saunders, David R., and Webb, Sam C. A Reply to Dr. Hiltner 108-110

Shaw, Don C. Orientation and Realization 162-163

Wise, Carroll A. Conversion 40-42

Wise, Carroll A. The Clergyman and Research 229-230

Editorial Board Changes 42-43

Communications

Davis, Will B. The Christian Science Point of View—A Correction .. 166

Mollegen, A. T. Observations on Dr. Salzman's View of Religion .. 113-114

Upjohn, Milo, et al. Ministers and Social Workers: A Communication 231-234

Wedel, Theodore O. Communicating the Gospel 164-166

Book Reviews and Notices

(The name of the reviewer appears in parentheses)

Adams, Hampton. Vocabulary of Faith (Henry Millis Shires) 181

Ashburn, Frank D. A Parent's Guide to Independent Schools and Colleges (Edward T. Hall) 177

Belgum, David. Clinical Training for Pastoral Care (Robert Nace) .. 48-50

Benda, Clemens E. Der Mensch im Zeitalter der Lieblosigkeit (Walter G. Muelder) 173-174

Bird, Brian. Talking with Patients (G. Douglas Krumbhaar) 176

Bright, John. The Kingdom of God (C. Charles Bachmann) 54-55

Brody, Sylvia. Patterns of Mothering (Ina May Greer) 183-184

Carlson, Edgar M. The Church and the Public Conscience (William B. Spofford, Jr.) 180-181

Casserley, J. V. Langmead. The Bent World (Harold Kenneth Fink) 241-243

Centennial Commission, Saint Elizabeths Hospital. Centennial Papers, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, 1855-1955 (Ernest E. Bruder) 47-48

Chessman, Caryl. Trial by Ordeal (Mark Shedron) 125

Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic (Dorothee F. Mindlin) 167-168

Cole, William Graham. Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis (Clemens E. Benda) 235-237

Cotton, James Harry. Royce on the Human Self (Peter L. Fuss) .. 245-246

Croxall, T. H. Meditations from Kierkegaard (F. W. Dillistone) .. 181

Doniger, Simon. (Ed.) The Minister's Consultation Clinic: Pastoral Psychology in Action (Harold Kenneth Fink) 51-53

Driver, Helen Irene. Multiple Counseling (Carroll A. Wise) 180

Duvall, Evelyn Millis. In-Laws, Pro and Con (Carroll A. Wise) .. 54

Dwyer, Walter W. Spiritual Healing in the United States and Great Britain (Harold Kenneth Fink) 172-173

Eaton, Joseph W., and Weil, Robert J. Culture and Mental Disorders (Carroll A. Wise) 238-239

Edens, B. David. Sexual Understanding among Young Married Adults (J. Frank Schulman) 125

Edge, Findley B. Teaching for Results (Randolph Crump Miller) .. 123

Frank, Blumenthal, and Knowles. Better Church Leadership (Edwin de Forges Bennett) 171-172

Galdston, Iago. Society and Medicine (Joseph Fletcher) 59

Garnett, A. Campbell. Religion and the Moral Life (John Wild) .. 178-179

Gorman, Mike. Every Other Bed (Lloyd E. Beebe) 122

Harkness, Georgia. Toward Understanding the Bible (Edith P. Drury) 123-124

Honsden, Leslie George. The Prevention of Cruelty to Children (Kenneth I. Wollan) 168-169

Hulme, William T. Theology and Counseling (Charles W. Stewart) . 117

Ikin, A. Graham. New Concepts of Healing (Harold Kenneth Fink) . 117-119

Jacobi, Jolande. (Ed.) Psychological Reflections (Roy W. Fairchild) 174-175

JENKINS, DANIEL. The Strangeness of the Church (Miles Renear) .. 182

JONES, ILION T. Principles and Practice of Preaching (Ronald E. Sleeth) 169-170

KARPMAN, BENJAMIN. The Sexual Offender and His Offenses (Arthur Lerner) 167

LAMB, GEORGE. (Translator) Tolerance and the Catholic: A Symposium (John Oliver Nelson) 184

LEE, R. S. Psychology and Worship (Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.) 180

LINDGREN, HENRY CLAY. Effective Leadership in Human Relations (W. Randolph Thornton) 120

LOUTTIT, HENRY I. Fear Not (Arthur G. Elcombe) 246-247

MACLENNAN, DAVID A. Pastoral Preaching (Walter P. Bell) 183

MARTI-IBANEZ, FELIX. (ED.) Psychiatry and Religion: International Symposia (Clemens E. Benda) 244-245

MOBERLY, WALTER. Responsibility (James Garfield) 55-56

MURRAY, J. A. C. An Introduction to a Christian Psychotherapy (Ernest E. Bruder) 237

NEW YORK STATE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. New Channels for the Golden Years (Paul B. Maves) 124-125

NIEBUHR, H. RICHARD. The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry (Carroll A. Wise) 46-47

OATES, WAYNE E. Religious Factors in Mental Illness (Harold Kenneth Fink) 50-51

OATES, WAYNE E. Anxiety in Christian Experience (Paul E. Johnson). 53-54

OATES, WAYNE E. Where to Go for Help (Ernest E. Bruder) 238

O'BRIAN, JOHN LORD. National Security and Individual Freedom (G. d'Andelot Belin) 116

ODIER, CHARLES. Anxiety and Magic Thinking (Charles R. Stinnette, Jr.) 243-244

OWEN, D. R. G. Body and Soul (Bruce E. Hanson) 170-171

PARKER, T. VALENTINE. American Protestantism (Orlo Strunk, Jr.) .. 181

REES, J. TUDOR, and USILL, HARLEY V. (EDS.) They Stand Apart: A Critical Survey of the Problems of Homosexuality (Harold Kenneth Fink) 44-46

REIK, THEODOR. The Search Within (Dana L. Farnsworth) 121-122

Rothney, John W. M. The High School Student, A Book of Cases (Philip C. Putnam) 58

Shaw, John Mackintosh. Christian Doctrine (F. W. Dillistone) 57

Shotwell, Louise Rossiter. This Is Your Neighbor (John Melville Burgess) 239

Slavson, S. R. (Ed.) The Fields of Group Psychotherapy (Robert C. Leslie) 120-121

Smith, Alson J. Religion and the New Psychology (Luther E. Woodward) 175-176

Stark, Phyllis. I Chose a Parson (Rosemary Clark) 178

Stern, George G.; Stein, Morris I.; and Bloom, Benjamin S. Methods in Personality Assessment (Orlo Strunk, Jr.) 59

Thiel, Rudolf. Luther (Henry M. Shires) 58-59

Thomas, George F. Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy (Joseph Fletcher) 58

Thomason, Calvin C. Human Relations in Action (George Wells) .. 56-57

Toynbee, Arnold. An Historian's Approach to Religion (Eugene V. N. Goetchius) 239-241

[Various.] The Intake Process (Henry H. Wiesbauer) 57-58

Weihofen, Henry. The Urge to Punish (Winfred Overholser) 115

Williamson, Geoffrey. Inside Buchmanism (F. W. Dillistone) 182

Wittenberg, Rudolph. On Call for Youth (J. Frank Schulman) 124

Wynn, John Charles. Sermons on Marriage and Family Life (Henry H. Wiesbauer) 246

Current Periodical Literature

Eisenberg, Leon, "Psychiatric Implications of Brain Damage in Children" (Edward Tulis) 188-191

Feldman, Sandor S., "Crying at the Happy Ending" (Edward Tulis) . 62-63

Southard, Samuel, "A Pastor's First Year of Counseling" (Edward Tulis) 61-62

Wahl, C. W., "Suicide as a Magical Act" (Edward Tulis) 186-188

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF THE JOURNAL OF PASTORAL CARE, published quarterly at 1312 Eye St., N. W., Washington, D. C., for Fall, 1957.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher—Council for Clinical Training, Inc., 2 E. 103rd St., New York 29, N. Y.; Editor—Rev. Ernest E. Bruder, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington 20, D. C.; Managing Editor—Dr. Luberta McCabe, 61 Lexington Avenue, Cambridge 38, Mass.; Business Manager—Miss Emily A. Spickler, Executive Secretary, 2 E. 103rd Street, New York 29, N. Y.

2. The owner is: Council for Clinical Training, Inc., 2 E. 103rd St., New York 29, N. Y. There are no stockholders. The Council for Clinical Training, Inc., is a charitable, non-profit corporation.

3. There are no known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

EMILY A. SPICKLER
Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of November, 1957,

MARY E. SPOFFORD,

Notary Public, State of New York, No. 31-3793600. Qualified in New York County. Commission expires March 30, 1959.